MODERN INDIAN POLITICAL THOUGHT

VIDYA DHAR MAHAJAN

S. CHAND & COMPANY (Pvt) LTD

Head Office : RAM NAGAR, NEW DELHI-110055
Show Room : 4/16-B, Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi-110002
Branches :

Mai Hiran Gate, Jalandhar-144008
Aminabad Park, Lucknow-226001
Blackie House, 103/5, Walchand Hirachand Marg, Opp. G.P.O., Bombay-400001
Khazanchi Road, Patna-800004
613-7, M. G. Road, Ernakulam, Cochin-682035
285/J, Bipin Behari Ganguly Street, Calcutta-700012
152, Anna Salai, Madras-600002
Sultan Bazar, Hyderabad-500195
3, Gandhi Sagar East, Nagpur-440002
KPCC Bldg., Race Course Road, Bangalore-560009
Pan Bazar, Guwahati-781001

First Edition 1987

Published by S. Chand & Company (Pvt.) Ltd., Ram Nagar, New Delhi-110055 and printed at Rajendra Ravindra Printers (Pvt.) Ltd, Ram Nagar, New Delhi-110055

Dedicated
to
Padmashri Shyam Lal Gupta
for his dynamism,
industry, foresight,
generosity and resourcefulness

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

I have great pleasure in placing this book in the hands of the readers. I have taken great pains in writing this book. I spent many years in collecting material and then in writing and rewriting it. I hope that the readers will be benefited by the care with which this book has been written.

I emphasize the importance of the study of the subject with which this book is concerned. Thinking by the people and the growth of a nation go together. It has rightly been said that those who do not think, perish. The problems of a country cannot be tackled by unthinking people. It is only when people think on various subjects and discuss the same among themselves that new and fresh thoughts occur to them. In this manner, the people of a country march ahead.

It is worthy of notice that political thinking in modern India has grown side by side with the progress of the country in different fields during the last more than a century and a half. Before that, there was very little political thinking.

In this book, the beginning has been made with the Renaissance in India. The political thought of Raja Rammohan Roy, Dadabhai Naoroji, Mahadev Govind Ranade, Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Lokmanya Tilak, Sri Aurobindo Ghose, Dr. Iqbal, Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, M. N. Roy, Acharya Vinoba Bhave, Dr. Lohia, Acharya Narendra Deva and Jayaprakash Narayan have been discussed at length. The political thought of Swami Dayananda, Swami Vivekananda, Tagore, Pherozeshah Mehta, Lala Lajpat Rai, B. C. Pal, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Maulana Muhammad Ali, M. A. Jinnah, Asoka Mehta etc. have also been discussed. In addition, such topics as the Drain Theory, Social Reform Versus Political Reform, the Revolutionary Terrorist Movement and Thought and Sarvodaya have also been dealt with. I hope that ample discussion on the various aspects of political thought in modern India will be found in this book.

The readers will find in this book all that they expect to read on the subject of modern Indian political thought. All suggestions for the improvement of the book in the next edition of the book will be welcome.

VIDYA DHAR MAHAJAN

D–805, New Friends Colony,
New Delhi-110065
1 September, 1986.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

The Renaissance in India and the Nationalist Movement

The Renaissance in India was not like the European Renaissance. It was not a return to India of the past ages. "It is an attempt of a re-awakened national spirit to explore a new creative impulse of self-expression that shall give the spiritual force a magnificent reshaping and reconstructing. Indian Renaissance, therefore, is the rejuvenation of Indian cultural life that puts on a new garb without completely being adrift from old moorings." Indian Renaissance was essentially a matter of spirit which produced striking changes in the realm of religion, society and culture along with a demand for national regeneration. There arose a new self-consciousness among the people of India. The soul of India began to unfold itself and break the shackles of the past. The Renaissance commenced in the 19th century and stirred the Indian soul to its very depths. It can be said without any exaggeration that Modern India owes everything to the Renaissance. The Renaissance was followed by reformation movements all over the country. It also paved the way to national regeneration. The spirit of Renaissance and the subsequent reform movements affected almost all the aspects of national life. There were new trends in the fields of education, literature, fine arts and science.

The view of Sir Jadunath Sarkar is that the Indian Renaissance was at first an intellectual awakening which profoundly affected our literature., education, thought and art. In the next succeeding generation, it became a moral force and reformed the Indian society and religion. In the third generation, it brought about the economic modernisation of India and ultimately the political emancipation.

In his book entitled "The Renaissance in India", Sri Aurobindo has attempted an analysis of the Renaissance in India. He points out that the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries in India were periods of political decline, defeat and anarchy which practically killed the creative spirit in religion and art. India began to imitate Europe and forgot her own achievements in the past. However, the life-breath of the nation moved as a subordinate under-current in the religious movements of Bengal and Punjab, in the political aspirations of Maharashtra and the literary activity of Bengal.

Sri Aurobindo points out that the Renaissance in India in the nineteenth century had three aspects. In the first place, it aimed at a recovery of the old spiritual gospel contained in the sacred books of the country. The researches of European Indologists helped the people in the West and in India to understand and appreciate the achievements of the Indians in the past. Philosophers and thinkers like Schopenhauer, Emerson, Thoreau and Royce highly praised India's wisdom in the past. Indian saints and Mystic-

leaders in India also helped the same process. Secondly, this re-invigorated spirituality inspired fresh activity in the fields of philosophy, literature, art etc. Thirdly, an attempt was made to deal in an original way with modern problems in the light of the new inspiration.

Sri Aurobindo did not compare the Indian Renaissance with the European Renaissance of the fifteenth century. He compared it to the Celtic Renaissance when Ireland wanted to go back to the older culture after a long period of British domination. In his analysis of the Indian Renaissance, Sri Aurobindo put great emphasis on the recovery of the spiritual traditions and heritage of the past. According to him, the establishment of new religious sects in India was a central event in the Indian Renaissance. The Brahmo Samaj, the Arya Samaj, Ramakrishna Paramhans and Vivekananda, the neo-Vaishnavism of Bengal and the Renaissance in Islam tried to go back to the past and recover the light of old wisdom. Sri Aurobindo referred to the cosmopolitanism, eclecticism, religious rationalism and logic of the Brahmo Samaj. Of all the leaders of the Renaissance in India, Dayananda appealed most to Sri Aurobindo. He considered him as a unique personality which created a vigorous Aryan manhood in India. Aurobindo found a national instinct in the reliance of Dayananda on Vedic wisdom. To quote Aurobindo, Dayananda "brings back an old Aryan element into the national character." Aurobindo gave credit to the Theosophical Society for getting some recognition in the West for some of the psychic, occult and esoteric achievements of the old Hindus. According to Aurobindo, Ramakrishna Paramhans was "the man who had the greatest influence and has done the most to regenerate Bengal." Vivekananda proclaimed to the world that India was awake not only to exist but also to conquer. In India itself, Vivekanada was a leader who wanted "preservation by reconstruction". Aurobindo referred to the achievements of J. C. Bose and Rabindranath Tagore in the field of Indian Renaissance. Aurobindo believed that the spiritual and intellectual advance of India was bound to come. To quote him, "The Renaissance in India is as inevitable as the rising of tomorrow's Sun and the Renaissance of a great nation of three hundred millions with so peculiar a temperament, such unique traditions and ideas of life, so powerful an intelligence and so great a mass of potential energies cannot but be one of the most formidable phenomena of the modern world."

Condition before Renaissance

Before the Renaissance in India in the nineteenth century, the condition of India was very bad. In the words of H. G. Rawlinson, "General condition of India in the eighteenth century was perhaps the unhappiest in the chequered history of the country." Particularly after the death of Aurangzeb, the Mughal Empire disintegrated rapidly. There was anarchy and chaos in the country. The Marathas spread their power in the North and carried fire and sword in the countryside. The Pindaries carried on their raids and destruction. The prestige of the Mughal Empire was completely gone after the sack of Delhi by Nadir Shah in 1739. There was anarchy in the Punjab and the Sikh Misls were fighting for supremacy with one another. There was no law and order in the Punjab till Maharaja Ranjit Singh established his authority in the beginning of the nineteenth century. The invasions of Ahmed Shah Abdali further added to the confusion in the country. Ahmed Shah Abdali defeated the Marathas in the third battle

of Panipat in 1761. Ali Vardi Khan set up an independent state in Bengal but the same was brought under their control by the English East India Company in the second half of the eighteenth century. The Nizam, Hyder Ali and Sultan Tipu were fighting among themselves and also against the British. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, the English East India Company started establishing its authority in Bengal and the Deccan but still their position was shaky. There was no settled Government or a regular system of administration.

As a result of lawlessness and anarchy, the material prosperity of the people was destroyed. Trade and communications were interrupted. The fine arts declined. The condition of the common man was miserable. To quote, "In social usage, in politics, in the realm of religion and art, we had entered the zone of uncreative habit of decadent traditions and ceased to exercise our humanity." It was indeed a dark age in every way and nothing of great importance was produced at that time. All indigenous arts and crafts declined. There was no place for reason in religion which was flooded by meaningless ceremonies and rites. Superstitions and dogmas were all powerful. The people were pessimistic and found no hope in the future. They became fatalists. Their vision became narrow. Their lives were miserable.

There was no safety of life and property. There were mercenaries and soldiers of fortune who roamed about in the country and murdered and plundered at will. Agriculture, industry and trade were utterly ruined. There was no strong political power in the country to defend her against the foreign invaders. In a way, the old order was dead and there was nothing in sight to take its place.

BRITISH IMPACT

It was at this time that India came into contact with the West and it was her impact with Britain which completely changed her. British imperialism helped the process of the unification of the country. British conquest of India was a conquest by a modern nation which had abolished feudalism in its own country and created a modern bourgeois society. The British brought the entire country under the control of a single administration. They unified the country by introducing a uniform system of laws and Government. The introduction of the modern methods of communication and transport produced a unifying effect. The new industries were all-India in their scope for the sources of their raw materials and their markets embraced the entire country. Even their labour force was recruited on a wide inter-regional basis. The economic life and lot of the Indian people were getting inter-linked and India's economic life became a single whole. The two new classes born in India at that time were the capitalist class and the working class. They were all-India in character and stood above the traditional divisions of caste, region and religion.

The highly centralised character of British rule in India promoted the growth of Indian nationalism. Centralisation meant not only the subordination of the Governments of various provinces and the Indian states to the Central Government, it also involved uniform and sometimes even common laws, institutions and taxes for the whole country. The Government of India was "one and indivisible" and its actions often had the effect of en-

couraging the people of India to feel that they too were or should be one and indivisible. Sometimes, the action of the Central Government united all the people of India belonging to various classes, creeds and provinces in a common opposition to the Government.

The introduction of the English language was an event of very great importance. It went a long way in transforming the ideas and mentality of the people of India. English education broke the intellectual isolation of the Indian mind and brought it into close contact with literature, philosophy, economics, politics, history and science of the West. It broadened the outlook of the Indians. They got new progressive, social and political ideas of the West in place of mythical geography, superstitions and rituals, legendary history, tyrannical monarchy and pseudo science.

It is rightly pointed out that "no single act of British policy has had a more lasting influence on the evolution of modern Indian thought than the decision in 1835 to use the funds provided by the Government to support education in the English language and to adopt the curriculum prevalent in English schools." This had a profound effect upon the future development of Indian politics and in fact on almost all facets of Indian life. It greatly accelerated the diffusion among the Indian intelligentsia of Western ideas and modes of thought. It fell upon the fertile and profound Indian mind and it acted as catalytic agent that caused an immense upsurge of creative thought and activity.

The English language made the Indians the inheritors of a great literature which was full of great ideas and ideals. Tagore writes, "We had come to know England through her glorious literature which had brought new inspiration into our young lives. The English authors whose books and poems we studied were full of love for humanity, justice and freedom. This great literary tradition had come down to us from the revolutionary period. We felt its power in Wordsworth's sonnets about human liberty. We glorified it even in the immature production of Shelley written in the enthusiasm of his youth when he declared against the tyranny of priestcraft and preached the overthrow of all despotisms through the power of suffering bravely endured. All this fired our youthful imaginations. We believed with all our simple faith that even if we rebelled against foreign rule, we should have the sympathy of the West. We felt that England was on our side in wishing to gain our freedom." Again, "It was a chivalrous West which trained the enthusiasm of knight-errants ready to take upon themselves the cause of the oppressed, of those who suffered from the miserliness of their fate and we felt certain that the special mission of Western civilization was to bring emancipation of all kinds to all races of the world. Though the West came to our shores as cunning tradesmen, it brought with it also the voice and a literature which claimed justice for all humanity."

The view of K. M. Panikkar is that the introduction of English langauge helped the cause of unity in the country and without it India would have been split into as many different units as there are languages in India and would have repeated the pattern of Europe with its conglomeration of mutually hostile units though professing the same Christian religion.

Dadabhai Naoroji declared, "The introduction of English education with its great, noble, elevating and civilising literature and advanced science,

will for ever remain a monument of good work done in India and a claim to gratitude upon the Indian people."

Surendranath Banerjea wrote, "It is England which has created in us those political aspirations, the fruition of which now we claim. Our minds are steeped in the literature of the West—our souls have been stirred by the great models of public virtue which pages of English history so freely present. Where shall we find the like of them; their sobriety, their moderation, their lofty enthusiasm for the public good, their scrupulous regard for constitutional principles, even amid the fervour and heat of revolutionary agitation, place them in the front rank of political leaders of all times and all countries. .The English language has been the means of uniting the varied races and religions, the peoples and complexities of our multiform civilization in the golden chains of indissoluble union. It is our common means of communication, North, South, East and West. Under the influence of the English language and English literature, in India the dry bones of the valley have become instinct with life. A new spirit is visible in the land. Englsh literature has communicated the Promethean spark which has galvanised us into a new life."

Sir Henry Cotton, a Congress President and a Member of British Parliament wrote, "We have done much more under our rule than was ever attempted by our predecessors to make a nationality possible. It is education, and education according to English methods and on the lines of Western civilisation, that has served to unite the varying forces among the Indian population. No other bond of unity was possible; the confusion of tongues was an insuperable obstacle."

Presiding over the Congress session in 1897, C. Sankaran Nair observed, "Just look for a moment at the training we are receiving. From our earliest school days the great English writers have been our classics. Englishmen have been our professors in colleges. English history is taught to us in schools. The books we generally read are English books. .It is impossible under this training not to be penetrated with English ideas, not to acquire English conceptions of duty, of rights, of brotherhood. .Imbued with these ideas and principles, we naturally desire to acquire the full rights and to charge the responsibilities of British citizenship."

In a London gathering in November 1915, M. Shyama Shanker declared, "Let the manifold blessings that English education has conferred on India be written in letters of gold and preserved in the shrines of grateful Indian hearts, for all ages to come. It is English education that has arrested the course of degeneracy in India. It is English education that has awakened her from her slumber under fast gathering ignorance and inertia. She (India) is knowing herself, knowing her glorious past and the grand destiny that awaits her in the future."

Rev. J. Lang made the following statement before the Indigo Commission in 1860: "'English education happily spreading in the country among the natives, is giving them a sense of freedom, leaning their minds with a regard to a sense of justice and imparting to them an English tone of revulsion against oppression. It is also welding the natives of the different Presidencies into one patriotic mass, with community of feeling on Indian subjects."

Regarding the influence of Western education on the minds of the founders and the subsequent political leaders of nationalism in India, Hans Kohn writes, "The rising generations assimilated European teaching with astounding receptivity. They quickly became nationalists, democrats and socialists. Cavour, Mazzini, Kossuth, Parnell and Mill became their teachers and heroes. A more intimate acquaintance with European culture had been attained and it was no longer accepted uncritically..Ruskin, Carlyle, Tolstoy and others played their part". (A History of Nationalism in the East, p. 118).

Dr. A. R. Desail points out that the study of the English language unfolded the treasures of democratic and nationalist thought crystallized in precious scientific works. Their study clarified, made more vivid and even fanned into fire the nascent nationalism of the educated Indians. Knowledge of the English language also brought within the reach of an educated Indian the most vital portion of the scientific, philosophical, sociological and literary achievements of the non-English speaking peoples. Through English translations, he could study Plato, Aristotle, Spinoza, Kant, Auguste Comte, Nietzche, Hegel, Benedetto Croce, Spengler, Karl Marx, Machiavelli, St. Simon, Bakunin, Proudhon etc. and was bound to be influenced by them. This widened his outlook and enabled him to think and dream of India as a part of world community.

The view of S. R. Mehrotra is that English education not only enabled the Indians to absorb European ideas, it also provided them with new and powerful means of inter-regional solidarity. The system of English education was uniform throughout India. English replaced Sanskrit, Persian or Hindustani as the lingua franca of the educated classes in India. The number of English educated Indians was not very large but they wielded an influence which was out of all proportion to their numerical strength. The English educated Indians began to show greater unity of thought and action.

Another factor which helped the Renaissance was the coming of the Christian missionaries in India from the beginning of the nineteenth century. They not only spread Christianity but also spread education in the country. Missionaries like Carey led the way. They opened schools and colleges and set up printing presses in the country. They also opened hospitals and started other works of public charity. As a result of their activities, there spread a lot of scepticism among the Indians some of whom were converted to Christianity. However, in the long run, the activities of the missionaries and their condemnation of Hindu religion resulted in a strong reaction among the Hindus and that led to the establishment of the Brahmo Samaj, Arya Samaj, Ramakrishna Mission, Radhaswami Satsang etc.

Another factor that helped the Renaissance was the press in India. The printing presses helped the publication of a large number of books which facilitated the task of education among the people. The newspapers and periodicals were also started and they also played their part in awakening the people.

The establishment of the All-India services—the Indian Civil Service, the Indian Police Service, the Indian Audit and Accounts Service—as well

as the Provincial services such as the Revenue and Judicial Services, bound together the various units of this vast country in a manner never attempted before and created the steel-frame within which the administrative unification of India became a reality. Besides, the creation of the Indian Army by the British, though recruited and officered by them mainly in their own interest, also proved to be an integrating force. Recruited as it was from the various parts of the country and organised on a non-political basis, the Indian Army built up a glorious reputation on three continents and provided free India with the basis of a national defence force.

The British in India constructed a large number of railways and roads which opened the interior and linked up various parts of the country. But for the railways, motor buses and other modern means of communication, political and cultural life on a national scale in India would not have been psssible. They played an important part in organising the political movement of the Indian people on a national scale. Such political organisations as the Indian National Congress, the Liberal Federation, The National Democrats, Youth Leagues, The All-India Conferences, The All-India Students Organisations, the All-India Kisan Sobhas and the All-India Trade Union Congress could neither have come into being nor been able to function on a national scale but for the facilities provided by modern railways, buses, and posts and telegraphs. The railways made it possible for the people of different towns, villages, districts and provinces to meet, to exchange views and decide upon programmes for the nationalist movement. But for the modern means of transport, no national conference could have bene held. Railways and buses made it possible to spread progressive social and scientific ideas among the people. Without the modern means of transport, books, magazines and newspapers could not have quickly been distributed throughout the country. Printed books might have been turned out in tens of thousands but without their quick distribution among thousands of villages and towns with the help of railways and motor buses, those books would not have reached the necessary centres. No mass education would have been possible without the services of the modern means of transport and hence their important contribution through the national awakening in the country. To quote Dr. Desai, "Modern means of transport were a formidable force in unifying the Indian people socially. The locomotive, triumphantly traversing a big physical distance, also helped to annihilate the social distance dividing the people living in different parts." The road system built by the British in India included a number of trunk roads stretching diagonally across the country. Their measurement went into thousands of miles and formed a frame-work linking most of the important centres of population, industries, trade and strategic points and subsidiary roads. This medium of transport became an important factor in the growth of a unified national economy. It created a national consciousness in the mercantile classes of India. Trades and craftsmen frequently journeyed from place to place and began to take interest in the emotional integration of India. Besides, the upper classes, the mass of lower classes were also mobilised. Like the railways, the road transport made possible the mass migration of people from one place to another. To get new employment or to improve their prospects, the poor people often used road transport from North to South and East to West, i.e. from Peshawar to Madras and from Calcutta to Bombay. That led to the establishment of social and cultural cohesion.

Regarding the effect of the new transport system introduced by the British in India, Iqbal Singh writes, "The ships that sailed up the Hooghly to unload their heavy cargoes, carried other commodities besides the manufactures of Europe. They brought with them news of wars of independence and revolutions. And not only news, but the news behind the news—the revolutionary ideas generated by the great social and intellectual ferment of the eighteenth century in Europe which has been instrumental in overthrowing powerful monarchies and empires. These were already finding eager customers in sub-tropical latitudes. The works of citizen Paine, for instance, were to be sold at the bookstalls at a premium."

The changes brought about by the British in the field of law also helped the cause of the Renaissance. K. M. Panikkar writes, "The establishment of the great principle of equality of all before law, in a country where under the Hindu doctrines a Brahman could not be punished on the evidence of Sudras and even punishments varied according to caste and where according to Muslim law an unbeliever's testimony could not be accepted against a Muslim, was itself a legal revolution of the first importance."

The view of B. C. Pal is that "The Penal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code have set up a standard of personal freedom that was unknown, truth to say, both to Hindu and Muslim criminal law and administration. The Criminal Procedure Code secures special privileges for European British-born subjects in India. But so far as the natives of the country are concerned, it has no room for any differential treatment as between one man and another. In the eyes of the British law, the Zamindar and the Ryot, the Brahmin and the Pariah, the prince and the peasant are equal. The stupendous mass upheaval which we see about us today could never have happened but for the levelling down process of the British law and administration which paid no regard to distinctions of caste or rank or wealth among the people."

The result was that there developed among the people a critical outlook on the past and new aspirations for the future. Reason and judgement took the place of faith and belief. Superstition yielded to science. Immobility was replaced by progress. The old apathy and inertia on the part of the people was replaced by optimism and a determination to go ahead. They were ready to remove the abuses from society and open a new chapter in the history of the country.

Indologists

It is true that English education had an adverse effect on some sections of the Indians, but by and large it led to a better appreciation by Indians of their past glory and attainments. The great Orientalists who established the Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1783, have earned from all Indians a lasting debt of gratitude for their pioneering work in the field of re-discovering India's great intellectual heritage. "Although the Orientalists were defeated on the question of education policy, their high evaluation of India's classical heritage helped eventually to foster in English-educated Indians a pride in their own past which was of cardinal importance in the nineteenth century Renaissance of Hinduism and the rise of Hindu nationalism."

Sir William Jones (1746-1794) translated Kalidasa's Shakuntala (1789), the Gita Govinda and the Manusmriti (1794). Charles Wilkins (c. 1750-

1836) brought out a translation of the Gita in 1785 and of the Hitopadesha in 1787. H. H. Wilson (1786-1860) translated the Vishnu Purana and the Rigveda. H. T. Colebrooke (1765-1836) also made his contribution in the same field. After a study of the Upanishads, Schopenhauer declared that their study was the most beneficial and the most elevating study in the whole world and solace both of his life and his Death. Christian Lassen (1800-1876), E. Burnouf (1801-1852), August Schlegel, Bohtlingk (1815-1904), Rudolf Roth (1821-1895) and Max Muller (1823-1900) were the founders of Sanskrit studies in Europe. The first printed editions of the four Vedas were brought out for the first time in the world by German Scholars. In 1848, Theodor Benfey published the Samaveda. In 1849-74, Max Muller printed the Rigveda. In 1852, Albrecht Weber (1825-1901) published the Vajasaneyi Samhita. In 1856, Rudolf Roth published the Atharvaveda with the help of W. D. Whitney (1827-1894). In 1846, Rudolf Roth published "The Literature and the History of the Vedas".

In 1834, James Prinsep (1799-1840) discovered the clue to the Asokan inscriptions. Alexander Cunningham and Fergusson (1808-1836) did pioneering work in the study of Indian architecture and archaeology. Grierson (1847-1941), Burgess, Fleet and Hultzsch were leaders in the foundation of new disciplines of Indian philology, ethnology and epigraphy. Monier-Williams (1819-1900), Muir, Griffith (1826-1906), E. B. Cowell (1826-1903), George Buhler (1837-1898), E. Senart (1847-1928), Dr. H. Jacobi (1850-1937), Lanman (1850-1941), Wackernagel (1853-1940), Garbe (1857-1927), Kielhorn, Hopkins (1857-1932), Sylvan Levi (1863-1926), Alfred Ludwig, A. Hillerbrandt (1853-1927), Oldenberg (1854-1920), Karl Geldner (1854-1929), A. A. Macdonell (1854-1925), M. Bloomfield, Franz Bobb (1781-1867), Deussen (1845-1919) and Dr. A. B. Keith (1879-1945) were great Sanskrit scholars. G.Turnour, T. W. Rhysdavids, C. A. F. Rhysdavids, Oldenberg, Stcherbatsky (1866-1942), Poussin (1869-1938), Paul Dahlke and others made their conrtibutions to the study of Buddhist history. M. Elphinstone (1779-1859) and V. A. Smith (1848-1920) were pioneers in the writing of the history of India. The works of the above-mentioned foreign scholars revealed the glory and greatness of India's past.

Indian Writers

The writings of Dinabandhu Mitra, Hem Chandra Banerjee, Navin Chandra Chatterjee, Bharatendu Harishchandra, Vishnu Shastri Chiplunkar, Ram Mohan Roy, Rajendra Lal Mitra (1824-1891), Sir R. G. Bhandarkar, Hara Prasad Sastri, R. C. Dutt, Tilak etc. affected the minds of the people of India. In 1860, Dinabandhu Mitra produced in his book entitled "Nila Darpan" (Mirror of Indigo) a scathing satire on the indigo planters of Bengal. Hem Chandra Banerjee (1838-1903) "voiced in his national lyrics the sense of impotence of his people to assert their legitimate rights and self-respect against their British masters." B. C. Pal writes, "Hem Chandra, however, was our special favourite. The intense patriotic passion that breathed through his poems captured our youthful mind in a way that no other Bengali poems had done. The new generation of English-educated Bengalees had already commenced to advance themselves to positions of trust and responsibility in the new administration. In the learned professions of law and medicine also, they were gradually asserting themselves as against the British members. A new spirit of independence and self-asser-

tion was increasingly manifesting itself in the conduct and conversations of the English-educated Bengalees. All these had already commenced to provoke a racial conflict in the country. Hem Chandra was in a special sense the poet of this new conflict and of the racial respect and sensitive patriotism born of it." Govinda Chandra Roy gave expression to his feelings of patriotism in some of his most touching songs.

Through his writings, Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941) appealed to the higher sentiments of the people of India to work for the glory of their country. He tried to raise the moral tone of his countrymen. He interpreted in a unique way the true spirit of Indian culture and civilisation. To quote Ramsay MacDonald, "'Tagore's poetry is India. It is the product of his devotion to Indian culture. It is the soul of a people, not merely the emotion of a man; a systematic view of life, not merely a poetic mood; a culture, not merely a tune." (Government of India, p. 245).

The greatest contribution of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee (1838-1894) was that he raised nationalism to the dignity of a religion. He was convinced that nothing could move the hearts of the Indians more than religion and therefore he pleaded patriotism as the highest religion. He identified the Motherland with Durga, Laxmi and Saraswati. As a matter of fact, he gave a new orientation to image worship by symbolising the goddesses as the Motherland." To quote Bankim Chandra, "It is Thy image we raise in every temple." In his Anand Math, Bankim Chandra gave a new image of the Goddess Kali. To quote him, "Kali is the symbol of degradation of India. She is black in colour because of the intense misery of the country. She is naked because India had been denuded of all her wealth. She wears the garland of human skulls because the whole country has become a vast burial ground. She has Siva under her feet to show that Indians are trampling down their own welfare." Bankim Chandra was the inspired sage.

The Anand Math of Bankim Chandra which embodies the patriotic song "Bande Mataram" (Hail to the Mother!) has rightly been called "the Bible of modern Bangalee patriotism." The view of B. C. Pal is that Bankim Chandra was a prophet of Indian cultural Renaissance. Aurobindo Ghose wrote thus: "As a poet and a stylist, Bankim did a work of supreme national importance not for the whole of India..but for Bengal which was destined to lead India and be the vanguard of national development." Bankim was a "seer and a nation-builder" and "one of the makers of modern India."

The literary and cultural heritage of Bengal was also enriched by Madhusudan Dutt (1828-73), Manmohan Bose and Girish Chandra. Madhusudan Dutt wrote Sarmishta, Tilottma and Meghnad Vadh Kavya.

Vishnu Krishna Chiplunkar (1850-1882) was a great writer and he called himself "The Shivaji of the Marathi language." He wrote bitter criticisms of Mahadev Govinda Ranade, Gopal Hari Deshmukh and Swami Dayananda. He made his literary contributions through the Kavyetihasasamgraha and the Nibandhamala. He was regarded as the Brihaspati of the Marathi literature. He compared Western education to "the milk of the tigress" because it inspired sentiment of virility and liberty. However, he was opposed to wholesale imitation of the West as he had a deep love for the institutions, traditions and culture of Maharashtra. He stood for "education

for the masses and took an active part in founding the Kesari and the Mahratta, the two Weeklies of Maharashtra. As a writer, journalist, educator and as a founder of the two presses, Chiplunkar was a very important figure in Maharashtra and he tried to arouse the latent patriotic sentiments of the people of Maharashtra. He was a selfless patriot and his place in Maharashtra can be compared to that of Bankim Chandra in Bengal.

Sir R. G. Bhandarkar (1837-1927) obtained recognition throughout India as a great Indologist and a Sanskrit scholar. He attained world-wide fame. He was keenly interested in social reform.

The first effect of free thinking on the immature minds of the youngmen who studied the English literature was more destructive than constructive, particularly in social and religious matters. The orthodox people were shocked and an alarm was created in their minds about the total wreck of the general framework of Hindu society which was so dear to them. It is well known that a section of the boys of the Hindu College, Calcutta gave up old religious ideas and social customs and deliberately adopted practices most offensive to Hindu sentiments such as drinking wine, eating beef etc.

Raja Rammohan Roy

However, the first and foremost positive effect of the contact with Western culture in India was that it instilled into the minds of the Indians a spirit of rational inquiry into the basis of their religion and society. This spirit was typified by the personality of Raja Rammohan Roy (1772-1833). The Raja was a man of unusual intellectual ability. He was a profound scholar of Sanskrit and Persian and a great admirer of British culture. He was one of those who felt that India had everything to gain from contact with the West and he tried to imbibe the best which the West could offer. He took a leading part in starting the English-medium schools in Bengal through which the youth could acquire the most modern Indian education. When the Government decided in 1823 to start a new college for Sanskrit studies, he wrote a letter of protest to Lord Amherst, the Governor-General and supported the introduction of Western learning in India.

Raja Rammohan Roy started in 1828 the Brahma Sabha which in 1846 was developed by Mahrishi Debendranath Tagore into the Brahmo Samaj. This organisation was the first deliberate attempt in modern India to reform Hinduism and restore it to its pristine glory. In the Trust Deed of the Brahma Sabha, the Raja dedicated it "for the worship and adoration of the eternal, unsearchable and immutable Being who is the Author and Preserver of the universe." The main emphasis of the Raja was on social reform in order to purge Hindu society of the evils prevailing in it. The Raja did not put emphasis on political matters. To quote him, "When we have to depend by the very conditions of our existence on all things and all beings in nature, is not this fiery love of national independence chimera... India requires many more years of British domination." The Raja attacked the strongest part of the citadel of Hindu religion and society. He opposed the worship of images of gods and goddesses, denounced Sati, polygamy and abuses of caste system. He favoured the re-marriage of Hindu widows. He repudiated the prohibition of crossing the sea by his voyage to England. By these successive shocks, he tried to reform the Hindu society.

Debendranath Tagore (1817-1905) was an associate of Raja Rammohan

Roy and after his death he took up the leadership of the reform movement. He was a man of deep learning and spiritual poise. He wielded great intellectual authority in the Brahmo Sabha. He "proclaimed the supremacy of human reason which was in its original institutions really the Eternal Light of God reflected through the mind of man over all scriptures and hallowed injunctions."

In 1862, there appeared on the scene a brilliant youngman named Keshab Chandra Sen. He was at this period of life deeply influenced by Christianity. He gathered around him a group of younger men who were zealous not only in propagating the reform of Hinduism but also in social service such as famine relief. Gradually, a rift developed between the old conservative group and the Samaj and the young reformers led by Keshab Chandra Sen. Ultimately, there was a split. The old party led by Debendranath Tagore came to be known as the Adi Brahmo Samaj. In 1868, Keshab Chandra Sen founded the Brahmo Samaj of India. In 1871, Keshab Chandra Sen died at the early age of 46. In 1878, the Sadharan Brahmo Samaj was founded by some of his followers.

Although the Brahmo Samaj was the visible embodiment of the new spirit, it never became a powerful movement. It began to lose its importance in less than half a century after its foundation. However, it effectively helped the progress of Hindu society by stemming the tide of conversion to Christianity by holding a living example of society based on progressive and liberal views and by supplying eminent persons who advanced liberal ideas in other spheres of life such as politics.

Raja Rammohan Roy introduced rationalistic principles in social and religious ideas. He was also the pioneer of political reforms in modern India. It is rightly pointed out that the liberal movements for religious and social reform were closely connected with the movement for political emancipation. In the words of Zacharias, "It is impossible to understand Indian political aspirations and activities if one divorces them from that nation's great new spiritual urge towards Truth and Justice—and Love—of which the one and the other alike are but outward manifestations." The truth of this remark becomes clear from a study of such personalities as Raja Rammohan Roy, Swami Dayananda, Swami Vivekananda and Mahatma Gandhi. The Renaissance of India, like her great aBnyan tree, threw numerous shoots which might appear as separate but had all a common root.

Life in India is dominated by religious and spiritual forces. It is not correct to minimise the influence of these forces in political and national evolution. It is true that the impact of western ideas on religions in India produced some evil consequences in the beginning, but those were transitory in character like a high tidal wave and soon passed away, leaving rich deposits of fertilising soil. The people educated in English did not, as a rule give up their traditional ways of life and habits of mind. They used Western learning for improving their own culture and adapting it to the new impulses created by contact with the West.

If we analyse the progress of the Indian people during the nineteenth century, it becomes clear that there was hardly any aspect of life and society which was not affected by the impact of the West on India. Side by side with the rise of new religious sects, we find a profound change in the orthodox Hindu religion. There was a persistent demand for the removal of

social abuses and the introduction of social reforms on modern lines. The ideals and methods of education underwent a revolutionary change. There was also a revolutionary change in the domain of literature and arts. There was created among the Indians a strong sense of patriotism and nationalism which was lacking before. All these transformed India from the medieval to the modern age. This gives an idea of the effect of Western impact on India.

The Prarthana Samaj

In 1849 was started in Maharashtra a society called the Paramhans Samaj. Its influence was restricted and it broke up very soon. Another organisation was started by Dr. Atmaram Pandurang (1823-1898) in 1867 with the object of rational worship and social reform. The name of the society was the Prarthana Samaj. In 1870, R. G. Bhandarkar and M. G. Ranade joined the Prarthana Samaj and strengthened it. The two main planks of the Samaj were theistic worship and social reform. Its greatest service was the organisation of social reform movement. It laid emphasis on the abandonment of caste, introduction of widow-remarriage, encouragement o female education and the abolition of Purdah and child marriage. In the words of Miss Collet, the Prarthana Samaj "never detached itself so far from the Hindu element of Brahamanism as many of the Bengalee Samajes, and both in religious observances and social customs, it clings far more closely to the old models." Another writer describes the Prarthana Samaj as composed of men paying allegiance to Hinduism and to the Hindu society with a protest.

The Arya Samaj

Unlike the Brahmo Samaj with its leanings towards Christianity, the Arya Samaj founded in 1875 by Swami Dayananda (1824-1883) who is considered by Sri Aurobindo as "one of its great and formative spirits", was a true Hindu Protestant Reformation. The slogan of Dayananda was: "Back to the Vedas." He stood for the pristine purity of Vedic Hinduism. He denounced all post-Vedic Hindu scriptures such as the Puranas, the Brahmanas and even the Upanishadas. He attacked Vedantism, Tantricism and popular Pauranic Hinduism. He condemned caste distinctions and advocated full equality for women with men. He started a violent campaign against untouchability. Swami Dayananda was a remarkable human dynamo endowed with extraordinary power and energy. His Arya Samaj succeeded in shaking the social structure of Hinduism in the Punjab. The view of Sir S. Radhakrishnan is that Swami Dayananda played an important role in the spiritual uplift of the people and kindled the fire of patriotism among them. He was a great social reformer. He preached social equality between man and woman. All modern social legislation had been inspired by his teachings. His teachings were based on reason. He advised the people against blind faith and asked them to examine everything and formulate their own opinions about the merits and demerits of religious beliefs and social customs. He was perhaps the first Indian to preach the gospel of Swadeshi and "India for the Indians". He anticipated Mahatma Gandhi in his constructive work.

The view of de Reincourt is that "there is little doubt today that the

great revolt in Bengal in 1905 was largely the indirect result of the Arya Samaj's religious nationalism and that Dayananda's organisation was the first real concrete nucleus of political nationalism. The Arya Samaj showed that Hinduism, long hibernating in a self-encolsed world of its own, was beginning rapidly to awake and face the realities of the nineteenth century. It also revealed that there was fire within the great body of Hinduism which, if struck by a competent hand, could be coaxed into a blaze of life and energy. The concept of the gentle and often servile Hindu began to disappear."

Theosophical Society

The Theosophical Society was founded in the United States of America in 1875 by Madame H. P. Blavatsky (1831-91) and Colonel H. S. Olcott alongwith others. In 1879, Blavatsky and Olcott came to India and established the headquarters of their society at Adyar near Madras. The Theosophical Society became prominent in the time of Mrs. Annie Besant who joined the Society in 1889 and came to India in 1893. She dedicated her whole life to the cause of the Society. She explained her mission in these words: "The Indian work is, first of all, the revival, strengthening and uplifting of ancient religion—Hinduism, Zoroastrianism and in Ceylon and Burma, Buddhism. This brought with it a new self-respect, a pride in the past, a belief in the future, and, as an inevitable result, a great wave of patriotic life, the beginning of the rebuilding of a nation." She started the Central Hindu School at Banaras which later on developed into the Banaras Hindu University.

The fundamental philosophical doctrines of the Theosophical Society, such as Karma and Nirvana, were common to both Buddhism and Brahmanism and hence the Indians were attracted towards it. The English educated Indians had a special reason to welcome Theosophy. Most of them had no faith in the many current religious and social doctrines, customs and traditions, but had not the courage to openly repudiate them for fear of social ostracism. They were "condemned to live in an agonising mental and moral conflict." They found in Theosophy a "veritable gospel of peace and salvation." By subtle philosophical theories of graded elevation of man by stages, Theosophy defended the current practices of Hinduism. It reconciled the ideal of universal brotherhood with the caste system and the fundamental unity of the Supreme Being with the worship of numerous gods and goddesses of Hinduism. By these means, Theosophy helped very materially to remove the "inferiority complex" from the minds of educated Indians. The great work of Theosophy was "in the moral reclamation of many of these educated Hindus who readily accepted the somewhat rigid disciplines of the new cult that demanded of its votaries complete abstinence from intoxicating drinks and absolute social purity for the attain ment of that high level of psychic and spiritual power which it promised".

Ramakrishna Paramhams

The life and teachings of Ramakrishna Paramhams and Swami Vivekananda—two spiritual giants—constitute a fascinating and inspiring chapter in the history of modern Indian thought. Ramakrishna (1836-1886) whose original name was Gadadhar Chattopadhyaya, was born in the village of Kamarpukur in the Hoogly district of West Bengal. At an early age, he

began showing unusual signs of religious ecstasy. At the age of 19, he came to Calcutta to live with his brother who had been appointed the priest of a newly erected temple at Dakshineshwar on the banks of the Ganges. Ramakrishna started his career of spiritual disciplines and attainments as a devotee of the great Goddess Kali. Kali symbolizes the great cosmic becoming. She combines within Herself two aspects. To Her enemies, She presents a fierce and terryfying visage. To Her devotees, She has all the love and tenderness of a divine and gracious mother. Kali is also known as Bhawani, Bhavatarini, Durga etc.

During his stay at Dakshineshwar, Ramakrishna experienced profound spiritual developments. He had visions, trances and ecstasies. Most of his time was spent in spiritual rhapsodies. He had a craving to see God face to face and he was successful in his mission. He adopted the spiritual practices of Islam and Christianity and he had fruitful spiritual experiences. The cumulative effect of these experiences was that he came to the conclusion that all spiritual paths within and without Hinduism, if correctly followed, lead to the same goal. His fame began to spread far and wide and all kinds of people came to see him. The rich and the poor, the educated and the illiterate, the villager and the Calcutta city-dweller, all were drawn to his place. The secret of his attraction was that he was a spiritually realised saint.

Among those who came to see him were the great literary and cultural figures of contemporary Bengal—men like Michael Madhu Sudan Dutt, Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar, Debendranath Tagore and Keshab Chandra Sen. All those who came to see him were given the same message. They were asked not to waste their time in partisan squabbles over the superiority of this or that creed, or this or that religion. They were advised to seek God with a pure and dedicated heart. Ramakrishna showed by his practical example that Hinduism was not an archaic and dying religion. Acting as a mighty spiritual beacon, he generated a powerful current of fresh life into Hindu society. He was not concerned with caste or creed, with empty ceremonies or shallow rituals. He was the apostle of divine realisation. He created a spiritual revolution.

Swami Vivekananda (1863—1902)

The greatest disciple of Ramkrishna Paramhans was Swami Vivekananda who carried the message of his Master all over India, Europe and America. In 1893, he attended the Parliament of Religions held in Chicago. He created a sensation in the great assembly by his brilliance and nobility. He came back to India in 1897 and was given a hero's welcome.

On his return to India, he undertook a tour from Kanyakumari to Kashmir and delivered lectures wherever he went. In those lectures, he thundered against the evil practices in Hindu society and called upon the people to leave no stone unturned to make their future bright. He made them realise the greatness of India in the past and gave them fresh hope for the future. He insisted on character-building, discipline and strength of mind. He brought about a new life among the people. He inspired them to work for the glory of their country.

It is clear from above that the nineteenth century witnessed a profound Renaissance in India which was brought about mainly as a result of the

British impact. The great social reform leaders and movements all combined to bring about an intellectual, social, cultural and spiritual ferment which shook Hindu society to its depths and gave birth to the national movement in the country.

There was a spiritual movement in India led by Sri Aurobindo in the beginning of the twentieth century. It interpreted Indian Renaissance as the rebirth of the soul of India into a new body of enthusiasm and energy, a new form of its innate and ancient spirit. It put emphasis on the greater and nobler action of the spiritual motive in every sphere of Indian life. It aimed at magnanimous achievements and higher activity which ends in the discovery, expression and manifestation of the Divine Self in human being. The mental, emotional and aesthetic parts and inborn potentiality of human beings were to be unfolded and developed fully for their greater satisfaction and finer nature of human beings. The movement found "in all-round spirituality the master-key not only to unlock the treasures of the past but also to remould the present on the basis of true appraisal both of the East and the West."

It is worthy of notice that "at first, the revived Hinduism was on its defence, rather cautious and timid in maintaining its position and inclined to compromise with the enemy. But soon it took the offensive, marched forward and even entered the hostile camp and asserted in ringing tones its right to live as one of the civilising influences of mankind."

As a result of these religious movements, there arose in this period a number of reformers, teachers, saints and scholars who purified Hinduism by denouncing some of its later accretions, separated its essentials from non-essentials, confirmed its ancient truths by their own experience and even carried its message to Europe and America. They were able to view their religion apart from the mythological, ritualistic and sociological forms in which it was embedded. They successfully interpreted Hinduism and its religious philosophy and main principles independent of Indian caste system, mythology, external rites and ceremonies. It was due to all this that today Hinduism is as fresh, vitalizing and vigorous as it was in any of the periods previously. The old fear that Hinduism might be overshadowed by Christianity or eclipsed by western civilisation and culture exists no longer. It has successfully outlived the Christian missionary propaganda of modern age as it survived the Muslim religious persecution of the Medieval period and the religious schism caused by Buddhism and Jainism in ancient times. It is now capable enough to meet any of the modern religions of the world on equal footing as their friend and ally in a common cause. "If the world in its present distracted state needs spiritual message and looks for a light to guide its footsteps in the darkness that has enveloped its path, renascent India is in a position to give it through the greatest of her prophets."

As a result of the efforts of the Brahmo Samaj and Raja Ram Mohan Roy, the Arya Samaj and Dayanand, the Prarthana Samaj and Ranade, the Ramakrishna Mission and Vivekananda, Sri Aurobindo, Maharishi Raman and Mahatma Gandhi, many social reforms were carried out in Hindu society. The Sati system was abolished. Infanticide disappeared. Women were given education and freedom. Child marriage has been declared illegal. Widow re-marriage has been made legal. Monogamy has become the

order of the day. Polygamy has become rare. Purdah system has disappeared. Inter-caste marriages are being performed. The ban on inter-dining has been lifted. Every effort is being made to remove untouchability from Hindu society. The Renaissance has enabled the Indians to pay more attention to life on earth and promote the general material and moral prosperity of the people.

Vernacular Literature

A significant feature of the Renaissance was the rapid growth of Vernacular literature in India. Bengal took the lead in this matter. The names of the distinguished writers in Bengali are Ram Mohan Roy, Akshay Kumar Dutta, Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar, Devendranath Tagore, Madhusudan Dutta, Rajnarain Bose, Dwijendra Lal Roy and Bankim Chandra Chatterjee. These writers were a prelude to the rise of Rabindranath Tagore who contributed to all aspeacts of culture and literature viz., prose, poetry, drama, novel, essay, short story, music, painting, dancing etc. Dr. Mohammad Iqbal wrote in Urdu and Persian. Munshi Prem Chand wrote in Hindi and Urdu. Sarat Chandra Chatterjee wrote in Bengali. Bhartendu Harishchandra and Maithili Sharan Gupta wrote in Hindi. Likewise, a lot of writing was done in Gujarati, Marathi, Telugu, Tamil, Malyalam, Kanarese, Urdu and Punjabi.

The prose literature in Indian vernaculars began with the translation of English prose works. Indian writers wrote essays in the light of Western ideology. They imitated Western style and theme in their writings. They applied Western methods of study to oriental literature. Indian drama was considerably influenced by Western drama. The style, technique and theme of the Western Playwrights like Ibsen, Galsworthy and Bernard Shaw were imitated by Indian writers. The growth of One Act Play in Indian literature was the result of Western literary influence. The works of writers like Laxminarain Mishra, Govinda Pant, Ashka, Premi, Udai Shanker Bhatt, Kailashnath Bhatnagar, Seth Govind Das etc. show the influence of Western drama. Indian story and novel were profoundly influenced by Western literature. Poetry was also influenced. English sonnet, ode and blank verse were imitated. Madhusudan Dutta in Bengali and Ayodhya Singh Upadhyaya in Hindi achieved marvellous success in blank verse. English lyrics were followed. English thought and style were imitated in poems on love and mysticism.

Spirit of Research and Discovery

Another striking feature of the Indian Renaissance manifested itself in the scientific spirit of research and discovery. The Preservation of Ancient Monuments Act was passed in the time of Lord Curzon. Under the guidance of the Archaeological Department of the Government of India and other research institutions and associations, a large number of excavations have been undertaken on the pre-historic sites like Mohenjodaro, Harappa, Nalanda, Kausambi, Hastinapur, Rupar, Kalibangan and Lothal. A lot of material of historical importance is now available as a result of these excavations and the reading and decipherment of ancient inscriptions.

The discoveries of Shri Ramanujam in the field of pure Mathematics and of Sir Jagdish Chandra Bose in another branch of science are real and

substantial contributions of new India to the knowledge of the world. Sir C. V. Raman and Dr. Meghnad Saha have made outstanding contributions in Physics. Shri P. C. Ray, J. C. Ghose and Dr. S. S. Bhatnagar made their contribution in the field of chemical science. S. Chandrasekhar has made his contribution in the field of astronomy. S. C. Ray and Birbal Sahani have also made their contributions to scientific knowledge.

Fine Arts

The spirit of the Renaissance had also its influence on fine arts in India. The first efforts at original production were to import Western models wholesale for presenting Indian motifs. The lead came from Travancore and Poona. This was resented by Bengal which made a bold bid for the conventions of the Buddhist school. This stimulated the study of old Indian art as practised through different periods and in different areas. The discovery of the Gandhara art and the Gupta art created a sense of pride among the people. In this connection, Annie Besant says that India rediscovered herself and got once again what "is the admiration of the world for its sublime spirituality, its intense devotion and its depth of intellectual insight, a culture which had endured for unknown millennia and its civilisation so magnificent that world has not yet seen its equal."

To begin with, Indian art was merely imitative and not genuinely creative. However, as a result of the work of E. B. Havell, Principal of the Calcutta School of Art and of Abanindranath Tagore, the painter, there came into existence a new school of art known as the Bengal School of Painting which derived its inspiration from Indian sources, from the paintings in the caves of Ajanta and from Rajput and Mughal paintings. As it derived its inspiration from traditional Indian sources, it produced art that was real and creative.

Abanindranath Tagore and his faithful disciples Surendra Gangoli, Nandlal Bose and Asit Kumar Haldar furthered the cause of reawakening in painting. The other artists of this period who earned international fame were Abdur Rahman Chaghatai and Amrit Sher Gill. Dr. A. K. Coomarswami has done a lot to emphasize the majesty, splendour and glory of Indian art. He completely revolutionised the Western attitude towards Indian art. The Schools of Arts in Bombay, Calcutta, Lucknow and Indore have made their contribution towards the revival of painting. The names of Fergusson, Percy Brown and Sir John Marshal are also important in this connection.

Music and dancing have also been influenced by the Renaissance in India. The Sangit Samaj of Calcutta and Jnanottejak Mandir of Bombay have created awakening in the field of music. Pandit P. N. Bhatkhande inaugurated new education in music and infused a new spirit for music among people. Vishnu Digambar also tried to revive music. His disciples spread all over Northern India and Bombay. Rabindranath Tagore also revived Indian music. Many other institutions have been set up at different places like Delhi, Lucknow, Gwalior, Calcutta, Madras, Poona etc. for the promotion of music. By his brilliant exposition and masterly demonstration of Indian music, Dilip Kumar Roy won admirers in Western countries. By his charming and scientific dances, Uday Shanker revived keen interest in Indian dances. The other prominent exponents of Indian

dances are Rukmani Devi, Ramgopal, Radha, Shriram and Damyanti Joshi.

The Renaissance in India revitalized all spheres of life and reawakened the people of India from their lethargy. The new spirit found its manifestation in the realms of religion, politics, literature, philosophy and industry. The reawakening in the field of politics caused widespread nationlism and the freedom struggle. Under the leadership of Dadabhai Naoroji, Pherozeshah Mehta, Surendranath Banerjea, Gokhale, Tilak, Lajpat Rai, Mahatma Gandhi, Sardar Patel, Jawaharlal Nehru and Subhas Chandra Bose, India won her freedom after a long struggle. The reawakening in the social field entirely changed the social life of the country. The various social evils were removed. A new feeling of unity has dawned in the country. The study of Sanskrit has been revived. Vernacular languages in India have become rich. Fine arts have made progress. Progress has been made in the field of science. There is an atmosphere of progress all around.

THE NATIONALIST MOVEMENT

As most of the persons whose political thought has been discussed in this book were connected with the nationalist movement in India, it is desirable to give a bird's eye view of that movement.

Basically, the nationalist movement was started to meet the challenge of foreign domination. The very existence of a foreign rule helped the growth of a national sentiment among the people. There was a clash of interests between the Indians and the British. With the passage of time, there was a realisation of that fact in India and that brought bitterness against foreign rule which resulted in the nationalist movement to drive out the foreigners from the country.

The spearhead of the nationalist movement was the Indian National Congress which was founded in 1885. From 1885 to 1905, the Congress was dominated by such leaders as Dadabhai Naoroji, Pherozeshah Mehta, Ranade, Surendranath Banerjea and Gokhale. Those Congress leaders believed in a policy of moderation and hence were known as "The Moderates".

The Moderates believed in orderly progress and constitutional agitation. They believed in patience, steadiness, conciliation and union with England. To quote Rash Behari Ghosh, "You must have patience, you must learn to wait and everything will come to you in time".

The Moderates believed in constitutional agitation within the four corners of the law. They believed that their work was to educate the people, to arouse national political consciousness and to create a united public opinion on political questions. For that purpose, they held meetings. They criticised the Government through the press. They drafted and submitted memorials and petitions to the Government, to the officials of the Government of India and also to the British Parliament. They demanded the wider employment of Indians in higher offices in the public services and the establishment of representative institutions in India. They were fully aware of the fact that India was a nation in the making and Indian nationhood was gradually coming into being and the same could not be taken

for granted as an accomplished fact. They worked constantly for the development and consolidation of the feelings of national unity among the people of India irrespective of their caste or religion or region. They opposed the restrictions imposed by the Government of India on the freedom of speech and press. They demanded the expansion and reform of the existing Legislative Councils. They demanded the introduction of the system of direct elections and an increase in the number of members and powers of the Legislative Councils.

In spite of their moderate policies, the attitude of the Government of India towards them was not helpful. Lord Dufferin attacked the Congress in 1887 and ridiculed it as representing the microscopic minority of the people. The same was the attitude of Lord Hamilton, Secretary of State for India. Lord Curzon declared in 1900 : "The Congress is tottering to its fall and one of my great ambitions, while in India, is to assist it to a peaceful demise". The British officials followed the policy of divide and rule to weaken the nationalist movement. No stone was left unturned to keep the Muslims away from the Congress and every favour was showered on Sir Syed Ahmed Khan to achieve that objective. An effort was also made to turn the feudal classes against the new intelligentsia in India, province against province, caste against caste and group against group. It is true that the Moderates did not achieve much success and very few reforms advocated by them were carried out. The foreign rulers treated them with contempt. To quota Lala Lajpat Rai, "After more than twenty years or more or less futile agitation for concessions and redress of grievances, they had received stones in place of bread." The methods of the Moderates were described as those of mendicancy or beggary. The Moderates failed to keep pace with the yearnings and aspirations of the people of India. They did not realise that the political and economic interests of the Indians and the British clashed and consequently the British people could not be expected to give up their rights and privileges in India without a fight.

However, it is not correct to say that the political record of the Moderates was a barren one. Taking into consideration the difficulties with which they were confronted, the Moderates achieved a lot. They laid the foundations of the nationalist movement on a very firm footing and the coming generations could safely build on the same. They created a wide political awakening among the people of India. They made them conscious of the bonds of common political, economic and cultural interests and the existence of a common enemy and thereby helped them to be welded in a common nationality. They popularised the ideas of democracy and civil liberty among the people. They were pioneers in the political field. Their agitation in the economic field completely undermined the moral foundations of British rule in India. It was rightly pointed out by Gokhale that if the Moderates had not followed a policy of caution, the Indian National Congress might have been crushed by the British Government at the very beginning. To quote him, "We are not beggars and our policy of not that of mendicancy. We are ambassadors of our people at a foreign court, to watch and guard the interests of our country and get as much for her as we can. That is our position".

The Extremists

While the Moderates were in power in the Indian National Congress, the Extremist leaders like Tilak, B. C. Pal, Lala Lajpat Rai and Aurobindo Ghose came to the front in the politics of India. They differed fundamentally from the Moderate leaders. While the Moderates believed in loyalty to the English throne and the continuance of British rule in the interests of the people of India, the view of the Extremists was that British rule in India was a curse and the question of loyalty to the English throne did not arise. While the Moderates believed in a policy of conciliation and compromise and were satisfied with the small concessions given by the British Government to the people of India from time to time, the Extremists did not bother about the petty concessions and demanded Swaraj for their country. While the Moderates believed in strictly constitutional methods of agitation such as reasoned and emotional appeals, lucid presentation of the case and the presentation of petitions to the Government, the Extremists were convinced that constitutional agitation will lead them nowhere. They also believed that the Government of India would not allow even peaceful propaganda to go on and intervene at every step to hinder and stop the progress of the nationalist movement. They believed that only a vigorous agitation could meet the needs of the situation. They believed in a policy of passive resistance which alone could make the running of the Government imposible. The Moderates worked on the hypothesis that if the grievances of the people of India were brought to the notice of the Englishmen, the same would be redressed. The Extremists rejected such an approach. They believed that the people of India were the masters of their own destiny and not any foreign power. Tilak pointed out that although Dadabhai Naoroji had spent 25 years in England trying to convince the Englishmen that injustice was being done to India, nothing had come out of it. The Moderates believed that the people of India were still not fit for self-Government, but the view of the Extremists was that the people of India were fit to rule themselves and self-government could not be denied to them on the ground of their being not fit. The Moderates believed that they would get what they asked for without any suffering but the definite view of the Extremists was that the salvation of India was not possible without sufferings and self-sacrifice. The Moderates considered cooperation with the English necessary for national development but the Extremists would straightaway assume full responsibility of the Government. The Moderates believed that taking over the Government by the Indians immediately would lead to chaos, but the view of the Extremists was that the existing order of things must be destroyed so that something better may take its place and that could not be worse than the existing system. The goal of the Moderates was "colonial form of self-government". but the ideal of the Extremists was absolute autonomy, free from foreign control.

The methods of the Extremists were boycott, Swadeshi and national education. Boycott was directed primarily against the foreign goods but it also included the boycott of Government services, honours and titles. The Extremists put emphasis on vigorous political agitation in order to put pressure on the Government. They believed in preparing the nation for freedom by active, non-violent agitation and passive resistance to authority. The objects of the passive resistance movement were "to destroy the

hypnotism that had caused the people and the country to have faith not only in the omnipotence of their rulers but also in their altruism". Another object was "to create a passionate love of liberty, accompanied by a spirit of sacrifice and readiness to suffer for the cause of the country". In addition to passive resistance, positive and constructive work was also necessary and that included encouragement to Swadeshi through the revival of Indian industries and boycott of foreign goods, the establishment of a national system of education and machinery of administration running independently of the existing Government and training in civil responsibility.

The Government of India passed the Public Meetings Act, the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, the Seditious Meetings Act, 1907, the Explosive Substances Act, 1908, the Newspaper (Incitement to Offences) Act, 1908 and the Indian Press Act, 1910 to take effective action against the Extremists. Several circulars and ordinances were issued which abrogated the right of free speech and criticism. Processions, meetings and demonstrations were banned. Students and citizens were prohibited from taking part in politics. The students who defied the orders were rusticated from their schools and colleges. Tilak was convicted in 1908 and awarded six years' rigorous imprisonment and he spent those years in Mandalay Jail in Burma. Lala Lajpat Rai and Sardar Ajit Singh were arrested in the Punjab and transported to Burma. Aurobindo Ghose was kept in jail for a year awaiting his trial. Madan Lal Dhingra was hanged. Police raids, house searches, confiscations and espionage became the order of the day. C.I.D. officers were let loose upon the society.

It is true that the Extremists suffered terribly but they added a glorious chapter to the history of the nationalist movement in India. They clarified its objectives, taught the people self-confidence, self-reliance and self-respect and prepared the social base of the movement to include the lower middle classes, students, youth and women. New methods of political organisation and new modes of waging political struggles were introduced.

Home Rule Movement

During the World War I (1914-18), the Extremists became the leaders of the Indian National Congress and the Moderates went into the background. In April 1916, Tilak started the Indian Home Rule League with its headquarters at Pune. The object of the League was to attain Home Rule or self-Government within the British Empire by all constitutional means and to educate and organise public opinion in the country for the attainment of the same. In September 1916, Annie Besant started a parallel Home Rule League with its headquaters at Adyar near Madras. Those who joined the Leagues were constitutionalists. They preached cooperation with the British Government and desired to help the British to win the War. However, they believed that Home Rule was India's birth-right and she must have it. British rule in India was insufficient in matters which concerned life of the nation and India would perish if she did not regain the right to rule herself. During the years 1916 and 1917, Tilak and Annie Besant worked in close cooperation with each other through their Leagues. Tilak confined himself to the Bombay Presidency and the Central Provinces and the rest of India was left to Annie Besant for her work.

The Home Rule movement marked the beginning of a new phase in India's struggle for freedom. It placed before the country a concrete scheme of self-Government. It emphasized the point that if the Congress really wanted to achieve its goal it must cease to be a club of arm-chair politicians taking to public life only in their leisure time. The national movement must be guided and led by leaders who were prepared to place their whole time and energy at the service of their country.

During the first three decades of the twentieth century, there was a lot of revolutionary terrorist activity in the country in which Maharashtra and Bengal played the leading role. Many British officials were shot dead and many of the revolutionaries were hanged. The revolutionaries were young men and young girls who sacrificed their lives cheerfully at the altar of the Motherland without any desire for any reward. By their sacrifices, they created a new spirit among the people.

Although the people of India helped the British Government during World War I, there was no appreciation of the services rendered by them. As a matter of fact, the Rowlatt Act was passed in 1919 in the teeth of opposition from the people. On 13 April 1919, there took place the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy in which a large number of persons were shot dead or wounded by the orders of General Dyer. Martial Law was declared in many cities of the Punjab and the people suffered terribly.

Non-Cooperation Movement

It was at this time that Mahatma Gandhi came to the front and became the undisputed leader of the nationalist movement in the country. He started the Non-cooperation movement in 1920 and the same was continued up to 1922 when it was suspended by him on account of the happenings at Chauri Chaura. During the Non-cooperation movement, students were withdrawn from Government schools and colleges. British courts were boycotted. The people boycotted Government Durbars and official and semi-official functions held by the Government officials or in their honour. The Congress boycotted elections to the legislatures. The people were asked not to join the army and use Swadeshi cloth and other things made in India. There was a lot of enthusiasm among the people during the Non-cooperation movement.

Swarajist Party

C. R. Das and Motilal Nehru started the Swarajist Party on 11 January 1923 and fought elections to the Provincial Legislatures and the Central Assembly. The Swarajist Party won a majority in the Legislative Council of the Central Provinces. It became the dominant party in Bengal under the leadership of C. R. Das. It won good support in U.P. and Bombay. However, the Swarajist Party was at its best in the Central Assembly under the leadership of Motilal Nehru. The Swarajists resorted to walk-outs as a mark of protest against the policy of the Government. They boycotted all receptions, parties or functions organised by the Government. Many of the Bills of the Government were thrown out. What was done in the Central Assembly was also done in the Provincial Legislatures where the Swarajists had influence. The view of Dr. R. C. Majumdar is that for the first time, the Legislative Assembly wore the appearance of a truly

National Assembly where national grievances were fully voiced, national aims and aspirations expressed without any reservation and the real character of the British rule was exposed. British autocracy and Indian bureaucracy stood exposed to the whole world.

Civil Disobedience Movement

On 31 December 1929, Jawaharlal Nehru, the Congress President, unfurled the flag of India's Independence on the banks of the river Ravi at Lahore. 26 January 1930 was observed the Independence Day. Mahatma Gandhi started the Civil Disobedience movement in April 1930 by breaking the Salt Laws at Dandi. He was arrested on 5 May 1930. Those who succeeded him were also arrested. There were demonstrations throughout the country against the Government. There was the boycott of British goods. The people suffered at the hands of the police but continued the agitation. In March 1931 was signed the Gandhi-Irwin pact by which the Civil Disobedience movement was suspended. Mahatma Gandhi attended the Second Round Table Conference held in London in 1931 as the sole representative of the Congress but came back empty-handed on account of the attitude of the British Government and M. A. Jinnah. During 1932, the Government took very strong action against the Congressmen to crush the movement. All Congress leaders were arrested. The people were beaten up. All kinds of atrocities were committed on the Congress volunteers and all those who sympathized with them. The movement was suspended in May 1933 and completely withdrawn in May 1934.

The Congress fought the provincial elections held in 1937 under the Government of India Act, 1935 and formed ministries in seven provinces. However, those ministries resigned in 1939 as the Viceroy declared war against Germany in September 1939 without consulting or taking into confidence the Indian leaders. In March 1940 was passed the Pakistan Resolution by the Muslim League at its Lahore session. On 8 August 1940, the Viceroy declared that the new Constitution of India would primarily be the responsibility of the Indians themselves. However, Great Britain would not transfer her responsibilities in India if any section of the people of India were opposed to it.

In March 1942, Cripps came to India with certain proposals with a view to seek the cooperation of the Congress in the prosecution of the War, but his mission failed as his proposals were not acceptable to the Congress. On 8 August 1942 was passed the Quit India Resolution by the Congress at Bombay. The result was that all the Congress leaders were arrested and they remained in jail till the end of the War in 1945.

Lord Wavell, the Viceroy of India, released the Congress leaders and negotiations were held at Simla to solve the deadlock, but thy failed on account of the attitude adopted by M. A. Jinnah.

In the first week of January 1946, the Parliamentary Delegation came to India to meet the Indian leaders. On 15 March 1946, Prime Minister Attlee declared in the House of Commons that India herself must decide her future Constitution and no minority in India would be allowed to place a veto on the advance of the majority. The Cabinet Mission reached Delhi on 24 March 1946 and on 16 May 1946 it gave its own solution of

the problem known as the Cabinet Mission scheme. In pursuance of that scheme, Jawaharlal Nehru formed the Interim Government on 2 September 1946. To begin with, the Muslim league did not join the Interim Government but later on it joined the same.

On 9 December 1946, the Constituent Assembly of India met at New Delhi but the same was boycotted by the Muslim League. On 20 February 1946, the British Government declared that it would transfer power into the hands of the Indians by a date not later than June 1948. Lord Mountbatten came to India in March 1947 as Viceroy. He carried on negotiations with the leaders of the Congress and the Muslim League and ultimately gave his 3 June Plan for the partition of India. The Indian Independence Act was passed in July 1947 to give effect to that Plan. On 14 August 1947, Pakistan became independent and on 15 August 1947 India became independent.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Agarwal, L. N. : *Indian Nationalist Movement.*

Ahluwalia, M. M. : *Freedom Struggle in India* (1858-1909) Delhi, 1965.

Andrews, C. F. : *The Renaissance in India*, London, 1912.

Argove, Daniel : *Moderates and Extremists in the Indian National Movement.*

Besant, Annie : *England and India*, Harrogate, 1903.

Besant, Annie : *India A Nation*, Adyar, 1930.

Bhartarya, S.C. : *The Indian Nationalist Movement*, Allahabad, 1958.

Bose, Nemai Sadhan : *The Indian National Movement*, Calcutta, 1965.

Bose, N. S. : *The Indian Awakening and Bengal*, Calcutta, 1960

Buch, M. A. : *Rise and Growth of Indian Nationalism*, Baroda, 1939.

Chatterjee, Nand Lal : *India's Freedom Struggle*, Allahabad, 1958.

Chatterjee, Ramananda : *Rammohan Roy and Modern India*, Calcutta, 1911.

Chowdhry, Sukhbir, *Growth of Nationalism in India*, New Delhi, 1973.

Dasgupta, B. N. : *The Life and Times of Raja Rammohan Roy*, New Delhi, 1980.

Dasgupta, H. : *The Indian National Congress*, Calcutta, 1946.

Datta, B. N. : *Vivekananda, Patriot-Prophet*, Calcutta, 1954

Datta, K.K. : *Dawn of Renascent India*, Nagpur, 1950

Datta, K.K. : *India's March to Freedom*, Orient, 1949.

Desai, A. R. : *Social Background of Indian Nationalism*, Bombay, 1948.

Gambhirananda, Swami : *History of the Ramakrishna Math and Mission*, Calcutta, 1957

Ganesh & Co. (Pub.) : *Indian Nation Builders*, Madras, 1921.

Gangadharan : *Indian National Consciousness—Growth and Development.*

Ghose, P. C. : *The Development of the Indian National Congress* (1892-1909), Calcutta, 1960.

Girja, Mookerjee : *The Rise and Growth of the Congress in India*, London, 1938.

Ghose, Aurobindo : *The Renaissance in India*, Calcutta, 1946.

Ghose, Aurobindo : *Bankim-Tilak-Dayananda*, Calcutta, 1947.

Ghose, Aurobindo : *Dayanand Saraswati : The Man and His Work*, Allahabad, 1917.

Ghose, N.N. : *England's Work in India*, Calcutta, 1909.

Griffiths, Sir Percival : *The British Impact on India*, London, 1952.

Gupta, A. (Ed.) : *Studies in the Bengal Renaissance*, Calcutta, 1958,

Gupta, D.C. : *Indian National Movement*, Delhi, 1970.

Heimsath, Charles H. : *Indian Nationalism and Hindu Social Reforms*, Bombay 1964.
Iqbal Singh : *Life of Raja Rammohan Roy*, Bombay, 1958.
Karve, D.G. : *Ranade, the Prophet of Liberated India*, Poona, 1942.
Lajpat Rai : *The Arya Samaj*, London, 1915.
Lovett, Sir Warney : *A History of the Indian Nationalist Movement*, 1919.
MacDonald, J.R. : *The Awakening of India*, London, 1911.
Macnicol, N. : *The Making of Modern India*, Oxford, 1924.
Majumdar, R.C. : *History of the Freedom Movement in India*, Vols. I, II, III, Calcutta, 1962-3.
Majumdar, R.C. : *Glimpses of Bengal in the Nineeehth Century*, Calcutta, 1960.
Majumdar, R.C. : *On Rammohun Roy*, Calcutta, 1972.
Mazumdar, A.C. : *Indian National Evolution*, Madras, 1917.
Mazumdar, P.C. : *Life and Teachings of Keshab Chandra Sen*, Calcutta, 1931.
Mehrotra, S.R. : *Towards India's Freedom and Partition*, New Delhi, 1979.
Mitra, S. : *The Vision of India*.
Monier-Williams, Sir M. : *Modern India and the Indians*, London, 1879.
Mukherjee, S.N. (Ed.) : *The Movement for National Freedom in India*, Oxford University Press, 1966.
Mukherjee, Hirendranath : *India Struggles for Freedom*, Bombay, 1946.
Mukherjee, Haridas and Uma : *The Growth of Nationalism in India*, 1957.
Mukherjee, Haridas and Uma : *India's Fight for Freedom*, 1958.
Muller, Max : *Rammohan to Ramkrishna*, Calcutta, 1952.
Nag, Jamuna : *Raja Rammohun Roy*, 1972.
Nevinson, H.W. : *The New Spirit in India*, London, 1908.
O' Malley, L.S.S. : *India's Social Heritage*, London, 1934.
O' Malley, L.S.S. : *Modern India and the West*, London, 1941.
Pal, B.C. : *Brahmo Samaj and the Battle of Swaraj in India*, Calcutta, 1926.
Pal, B.C. : *Indian Nationalism*, Madras, 1948.
Pal, B.C. : *The New Spirit*, Calcutta, 1907.
Raghuvamshi, V.P.S. : *Indian Nationalist Movement and Thought*, Agra, 1959.
Ram Gopal : *How India Struggled for Freedom*, Bombay, 1967.
Ranade, M.G. : *Religions and Social Reforms*.
Rao, B. Shiva : *India's Freedom Movement*, New Delhi, 1972.
Ray, Nihar Ranjan : *Nationalism in India : A Historical Analysis of its Stresses and Strains*, Aligarh, 1973.
Romain Rolland : *Life of Ramakrishna*, Calcutta, 1931.
Romain Rolland : *The Life of Vivekananda and the Universal Gospel*, Almora, 1947.
Sarda, Harbilas : *Sankara and Dayananda*, Ajmer, 1944.
Sarkar, Indira : *Social Thought in Bengal*, Calcutta, 1949.
Sen, Amit : *Notes on the Bengal Renaissance*, Calcutta, 1957.
Sharma, S.R. : *Renaissance of Hinduism*.
Singhal, D.P. : *Nationalism in India and other Historical Essays*.
Sinha, Sasadhar : *Indian Independence in Perspective*, Allied Publishers, 1964.
Sitaramayya, Pattabhi : *History of Indian National Congress*, 2 Vols.
Smith, William R. : *Nationalism and Reforms in India*, New Haven, 1938.
Tara Chand : *History of Freedom Movement in India*, Vols. I to IV.
Wadud, Kazi Abdul : *Creative Bengal*, Calcutta, 1950.
Wolpert, S.A. : *Tilak and Ghokhale : Revolution and Reform in the Making of Modern India*, Berkeley, 1962.
Zacharias, H.C.E. : *Renascent India*, London, 1933.

CHAPTER II

Raja Rammohan Roy (1772-1833)

In the words of Rabindranath Tagore, Raja Rammohan Roy "was the only person in his time to realise completely the significance of the modern age. He knew that the ideal of human civilisation does not lie in isolation or independence, but in the brotherhood or inter-independence of individuals as well as nations. His attempt was to establish our peoples on the full consciousness of their own cultural personality, to make them comprehend the reality of all that was unique in their civilisation and simultaneously to approach other civilisations in the spirit of sympathetic cooperation." B. C. Pal wrote about Raja Rammohan Roy, "The Raja was the first to deliver the message of political freedom to India. He so keenly felt the loss of this freedom by his people that even as a boy yet within his teens he left his country and travelled to Tibet because he found it difficult to tolerate the domination of his country by another nation though subsequently with close acquaintance with the culture and character of the British people who seemed to him to have been more intelligent, most steady and moderate in their conduct, the Raja became inclined in their favour feeling persuaded that their rule, although a foreign yoke, would lead more speedily and surely to the amelioration of the native inhabitants. But he never believed or found it possible to tolerate the idea that India's unending subjection to the British rule was at all necessary for the amelioration of the Indian people."

Rammohan Roy was born in 1772 in a well-to-do Brahman family in Bengal. When he was hardly 15, he wrote a pamphlet in Bengali in which he denounced idol worship. The result was that he was turned out from his family and he had to live in exile. From 1805 to 1814, he was in the service of the English East India Company. After his retirement, he settled in Calcutta and devoted himself entirely to the service of the people. In 1814, he started the Atmiya Sabha. In 1828, he founded the Brahmo Samaj to bring together the peoples of the world, irrespective of caste, creed and country, at the feet of the One Eternal God. In 1831, he went to England to plead the cause of the Mughal Emperor of Delhi. On 27 September 1833, he died at Bristol.

Political Thinker

Dr. B. B. Majumdar writes that Raja Rammohan Roy was the father of modern political movement. His position in the history of political thought in modern India is the same as that of Aristotle in Western political thought. He fought vigorously against the corrupt practices in the Hindu religion, against the superstitions and inhuman customs of Hindu society and against the narrow and parochial outlook of Indian mind. Behind all

his ideas of social and religious reform lay the ideal of bringing about the political regeneration of India. The Raja wrote in 1828, "I regret to say that the present system of religion adhered to by the Hindus is not well calculated to promote their political interest. The distinction of castes, introducing innumerable divisions and sub-divisions among them, has entirely deprived them of political feeling and the multitude of religious rites and ceremonies and the laws of purification had totally disqualified them from understanding any difficult enterprise. It is, I think, necessary that some changes should take place in their religion at least for the sake of their political advantage and social comfort." The Raja clearly recognised the inter-dependence of political advancement and social and religious progress.

His Method

The Raja followed the inductive and historical method. He was interested in practical political problems rather than in general theories concerning the origin and nature of the state. The political ideas of the Raja are to be found mainly in the following writings:—

1. Brief remarks regarding modern encroachments on the ancient rights of females according to the Hindu Law of Inheritance (1822).
2. Petitions against the Press Regulation to the Supreme Court and the King-in-Council (1823).
3. A Letter to Lord Amherst on English Education and against Sanskrit (1823).
4. Final Appeal to the Christian Public (1823).
5. A Brief Sketch of the Ancient and Modern boundaries and History of India (1832).
6. Questions and answers on the judicial and revenue systems of India etc. (1832).
7. Remarks on settlement in India by Europeans (1831).
8. His letters and speeches.

The Raja was a diligent student of history. According to him, the loss of independence of India was due to "the dissensions and pusillanimous conduct of the native princes and chiefs", "the ignorance existing in the East of the modern improvements in the art of war", "absence of patriotism among the people of India", "our excess in civilisation and abstinence from the slaughter even of animals, as well as our division into castes which has been the cause of want of unity among us." He was familiar not only with the ancient and medieval history of India but also with the history and working of the British Indian administration. He was also familiar with the history of Europe and the United States.

Foreign Influences on Him

The ideas and actions of Raja Rammohan Roy were influenced by many foreign writers. Among them were Montesquieu, Blackstone and Bentham. The Raja derived his ideas of the separation of powers and the rule of law from the "Spirit of Laws" (1748) of Montesquieu.

"Fragment on Government" (1776) and "Introduction to Morals and Legislation" (1789) of Bentham had great influence on the Raja. According to Bentham, "Natural right is simple nonsense: natural and imprescriptible rights, rhetorical nonsense—nonsense upon stilts." This view of Bentham must have induced the Raja to reject the theory of natural rights. It was also due to the influence of Bentham that the Raja insisted on the codification of civil and criminal law and also enunciated the principles of codification. The Raja made a clear distinction between law and morality and that was due to the influence of Bentham. The Raja was also influenced by the utilitarian theory in the field of social reform. The view of Bentham was that the theory of the greatest good of the greatest number will justify the summary abrogation of a practice or principle that originated a thousand years ago The Raja also wrote, "You have at the same time quoted two or three authorities to show that rites should be performed according to the custom of the country. I reply, female murder, murder of Brahman, parricide and similar heinous crimes, cannot be reckoned amongst pious acts by alleging the custom of a country in their behalf. It is of no consequence to affirm that this (Sati) is customary in any particular country; if it were universally practised, the murders would still be criminal." The view of Bentham was that it becomes a duty to resist the Government in case the benefit to be secured by it is greater than the evil of revolution. A similar view was expressed by the Raja in these words: "If mankind are brought into existence, and by nature formed to enjoy the comforts of society and the pleasure of an improved mind, they may be justified in opposing any system, religious domestic or political, which is inimical to the happiness of society or calculated to debase the human intellect."

However, the Raja differed from Bentham in certain respects. Benthem totally ignored the historical development of a people and assumed that all human beings, irrespective of their race, culture and traditions, are fundamentally the same in their requirements. Therefore, Bentham was prepared to devise codes for India, Russia, England, Spain and Morocco on one and same principle. The Raja differed from Bentham in this respect. His view was that "a code of criminal law for India should be founded as far as possible on those principles which are common to and acknowledged by all the different sects and tribes inhabiting the country." According to the Raja, the code of India should conform to the laws and customs of India and it must not ignore the traditions of the people.

The Raja was also influenced by "Commentaries on the Laws of England" by Sir William Blackstone. The Raja was a close student of Blackstone. He insisted on the absolute separation of powers in his scheme for reforming the Constitution of India. However, in his demand for the codification of the laws of India, the Raja rejected the authority of Blackstone and relied on that of Bentham.

Liberty

Raja Rammohan Roy loved liberty in all its forms and especially the freedom of thought. He combined in himself the finest thoughts of Eastern and Western culture. His study of Western thought and movements confirmed his belief in the value of liberty.

The Raja did not have a parochial outlook with regard to liberty. It embraced the whole world. In the spiritual field, he was the prophet of universal religion. Likewise, he wanted to see the triumph of the principles of liberty everywhere in the world. He saw no inherent antagonism between nationalism and internationalism. His view was that Indian nationalism could gain ground only when the nations of Western Europe became free. It is said that when the Raja heard the news of the establishment of a constitutional Government in Spain, he gave a public dinner at the Town Hall at Calcutta. He was overjoyed when he heard of the success of the Second French Revolution in 1830. When the constitutional Government of Naples was overthrown in 1821, he was so much unhappy that he cancelled an engagement with Mr. Buckingham, the editor of the Calcutta Journal and wrote to him thus in that connection, "From the late unhappy news, I am obliged to conclude that I shall not live to see liberty universally restored to the nations of Europe and Asiatic nations, especially those that are European colonies possessed of a greater degree of the same blessing than what they now enjoy. Under these circumstances, I consider the cause of the Neapolitans as my own and their enemies as ours. Enemies to liberty and friends of despotism have never been and never will be ultimately successful." Miss Collet tells us how "at Cape Colony on his way to England, the sight of the tricolour flag on two French ships lying at anchor in Table Bay fired his enthusiasm. Lame as he then was owing to a serious fall from the gangway ladder, he insisted on visiting them. The sight of the republican flag seemed to render him insensible to pain."

His enthusiasm for the Reform Act of 1832 was due to his love for liberty which was liberty not only for the Englishmen but also for mankind. Speaking on the Bill he said, "The struggles are not merely between the reformers and anti-reformers, but between liberty and oppression throughout the world; between justice and injustice and between right and wrong. We clearly perceive that liberal principles in politics and religion have been since long gradually but speedily gaining ground notwithstanding the opposition and obstinacy of despots and bigots." After the passing of the Reform Bill, he wrote to William Rathbone, "As I publicly avowed that in the event of the Reform Bill being defeated I would renounce my connection with this country (England), I refained from writing to you or any other friend in Liverpool until I knew the result."

V. N. Naik writes about Rammohan Roy, "Himself a devout worshipper at the shrine of liberty, he realised even so far back as 1820 that liberty to be properly enjoyed must be regulated liberty, that freedom has its own restraints as much as order. In the field of social and religious reform no less than in journalism and politics, his one endeavour was to awaken his countrymen not only to their rights as free men, but also to their obligations to society." (Indian Liberalism, p. 1).

Civil Liberty

The Raja was inspired by the principles of the English Constitution and he was anxious to secure for his countrymen the same guarantees of individual liberty as were enjoyed by Englishmen. He was the first Indian who demanded civil liberty with all its implications. He was fully aware

of the limitations of his countrymen and never thought of demanding political liberty for them. He was conscious of the ignorance and superstitions of the people of India and the lack of public spirit in their character.

Raja Rommohan Roy knew full well that India was neither a sovereign state nor a democracy. Hence, the people of India could hardly enjoy any civil liberty. Civil rights were not inherent in man and could exist only in a democratically organised state. However, the Raja held that the Indians "are fortunately placed by Providence under the protection of the whole British Nation, or that the King of England and his Lords and Commons are their Legislators, and that they are secured in the enjoyment of the same civil and religious privileges that every Briton is entitled to in England." It is true that he did not specifically state what those civil rights were but by implication he made it quite clear that he understood by civil liberty, the right of the life and liberty, the right of property, freedom of opinion and freedom of religious worship.

The Raja was a great admirer of the British Government in India. The reason given by him was that the English people delivered the Indians from the tyranny of their former rulers under whom the people were never secure in the enjoyment of their civil rights. In his "Final Appeal to the Christian Public", he thanked "the Supreme Disposer of the Universe for having unexpectedly delivered this country from the long continued tyranny of its former rulers and placed it under the Government of the English, a nation who not only are blessed with the enjoyment of civil and political liberty, but also interest themselves in promoting liberty and social happiness, as well as free inquiry into literary and religious subjects, among those nations to which that influence extends."

In his appeal to the King-in-Council, the Raja drew attention to the fact that under the Mohammedan rule, the Hindus enjoyed every political privilege in common with the Muslims, "being eligible to the highest offices in the state, entrusted with the command of armies and the Government of provinces and often chosen as advisers to their princes." However, under the English East India Company, the Indians were compensated for the loss of those privileges by the more secure enjoyment of civil and religious rights. To quote the Raja, "Notwithstanding the loss of political rank and power, they (Indians) considered themselves much happier in the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty than were their ancestors." The Raja demanded again and again that those rights should be protected by the British Government in India. He pointed out that if that was not done, "the basis on which they have founded their hopes of comfort and happiness under the British power, will be destroyed."

The Raja suggested certain reforms by which civil rights could be guaranteed to the people of India. For that purpose, he demanded the codification of laws, the separation of powers, the integrity, efficiency and independence of the judges, introduction of the jury system in India and the Habeas Corpus Act and the legal responsibility of officials. He wanted the civil and criminal law to be codified in such a way as not to require any explanation by a reference to any other book of authority. He also believed that a Government to be good must be based on the principle of separation of powers. According to him, the union of powers was not required to

ensure efficient administration. Neither the Governor-General nor any of the civil servants of the English East India Company should be allowed to issue Regulations and Ordinances. He criticised strongly the union of magisterial and judicial powers in the Collector of a District. To quote the Raja, "In every civilised country, rules and codes are found proceeding from one authority and their execution left to another. Experience shows that unchecked power often leads the best men wrong and produces general mischief."

The Raja suggested many reforms to bring about purity in the administration of justice. One reform was the "superintendence of public opinion". His suggestion was that the people should be allowed to watch the judicial proceedings so that the judges may follow the principles of law and equity. Every person should have a right to be present during the trial of cases in any court and to make notes of cases decided and publish them in any manner he thought proper for general information. He was fully aware of the possibility of abuse of that right but he held that the guilty would be punished. He also wanted the number of the judges to be increased.

The Raja wanted some action to be taken against the vices of perjury and forgery among the litigants. For that purpose, he suggested the remodelling of the old Panchayat system in Bengal. His plan was to use the old system as the basis of trial by jury. According to him, 3, 5 or a larger number of respectable Indians should be selected as jurors. Three times the number of jurors required for sitting on a trial should be summoned and the persons actually to serve on the jury should be taken by lot so that neither the judges nor the parties might be able to know beforehand which persons would sit on the trial of a case. The European judges at the station should keep a list of persons qualified to serve as jurors. Cases should be conducted in Vernacular so that the members of the jury may follow the proceedings. The members of the jury should be kept apart and required to decide without separating. A European judge should be present to maintain order and an Indian judge to guard against any private influence. Where the judge and the jury were unanimous, no appeal should be allowed. The view of the Raja was that "It is the only system by which present abuses consisting of perjury, forgery and corruption can be removed."

The Raja also emphasized the necessity of enforcing responsibility of every action of an officer in his official capacity through judicial proceedings. According to him, the judges of Circuit should be required to keep a vigilant watch over the proceedings of the magistrates within their jurisdiction and institute an investigation personally and on the spot, into any complaint preferred against them. Likewise, the Assistant judge should be authorised to receive written complaints of any abuse of their power from persons who feel themselves oppressed by the police. He also demanded that the salary of Indian officers in the Judicial Department should be substantially increased. He was against the proposal of reducing the salaries of the European judges.

The view of the Raja was that the protection of property was one of the fundamental rights of the subjects. It was inviolable even against the Government.

The Raja admired the British rule in India for its policy of religious toleration. Like Locke, he held that the state should not interfere with the subjects in religious matters. To quote him, "True religion needs not the aid of the sword or the legal penalties for its protection." He put emphasis on the necessity of maintaining religious toleration by the Government of India as the conquerors had always ridiculed the religion of the conquered and tried to impose their religion on the subject people. He hoped that the British in India would not follow the example of the conquerors of the past. He criticized the method of preaching adopted by the Christian missionaries in India in these words, "To introduce a religion by means of abuse and insult, or by affording the hope of worldly gain is inconsistent with reason and justice. If by the force of argument they can prove the truth of their own religion and the falsity of that of Hindus, many would of course embrace their doctrines, and in case they fail to prove this, they should not undergo such useless trouble, nor tease Hindus any longer by their attempt at conversion."

Freedom of the Press

Raja Rammohan Roy attached the greatest importance to the right of freedom of expression and the freedom of the press. His Memorial to the Supreme Court and Appeal to the King-in-Council regarding the freedom of the press are regarded as "the Areopagitica of Indian history". Like Milton, the Raja emphasized the fact that the freedom of the press is as beneficial to the people as to the Government. Whatever is of highest excellence in Government or of greatest virtue and enlightenment in society, can be secured only by the freedom of the press. The licensing and tyranny of opinion go hand in hand with bad Government. However, it cannot be denied that the work of Milton covers a much wider ground than that of the Raja. Milton raised his voice on behalf of the freedom of mind itself as he was opposed to the licensing of all kinds of publications. The Raja was concerned only with the freedom of the periodical press as the Regulation of 1823 was aimed at restricting not all kinds of publications but only the periodical press.

The view of the Raja was that the Indian subjects of His Majesty had enjoyed the liberty of the press "for so many years since the establishment of the British rule." According to the Raja, by issuing the Regulation for licensed press on 14 March 1823, "the local executive authorities certainly assumed the power of legislation in matters of the highest moment." He prayed to the King-in-Council to prohibit any authority in India from assuming the legislative power.

The view of the Directors of the English East India Company was that "a free press is a fit associate and necessary appendage of a representative constitution and as the Government of India can in no sense be called a representative or a popular Government, there should be no freedom of press in India." The contention of the Raja was that as the Government of India was not representative, it was all the more necessary to have freedom of discussion. A free press would prove to be the most excellent channel of information to the supreme authorities in England. The Raja pointed out that a free press had never caused a revolution in any part of the world.

On the other hand, revolutions had taken place where despotic Governments tried to keep the people in ignorance by denying them the freedom of the press. To quote him, "Notwithstanding the tyranny and oppression of Gengis Khan and Tamerlane, their empire was not so lasting as that of the Romans who, to the proud title of conquerors added the more glorious one of Enlighteners of the world." Again "A Government conscious of rectitude of intention cannot be afraid of public scrutiny by means of a press."

The view of the Directors was that there was no public opinion in India and hence discussions had to take place in England and not in India. The reply of the Raja was that there were a number of enlightened people in India and if freedom of discussion was allowed they could explain to the public the excellence of the Government established by the British in India.

The view of the Directors was that free press in India would discuss the conduct of the administrators and that would result in loss of respect for authority. The Raja pointed out that free discussions had not brought hatred and contempt against the Government in India. As a matter of fact, they had enhanced the prestige and popularity of the Government

The view of the Directors was that free discussions in newspapers might goad on the sepoys to revolt. The reply of the Raja was that the loyalty of the people of India to the British Government was deep and unshakeable. As a proof of their loyalty, the people entrusted the Government with their money while under previous Governments, they buried their riches under the ground. He also pointed out that the citizens of Calcutta offered prayers for the victory of the British during the Third Maratha War and the war with Nepal.

The Raja maintained that by the freedom of the press, he did not intend to subvert the existing Government but to strengthen and popularise it. To quote the Raja, "Every good ruler who is convinced of the imperfections of human nature and reverences the Eternal Governor of the world must be conscious of the great liability to error in managing the affairs of a vast empire and therefore he will be anxious to afford every individual the readiest means of bringing to his notice whatever may require his interference. To secure this important object, the un-restrained liberty of publication is the only effectual means that can be employed."

The view of the Raja was that the freedom of the press is equally necessary for the sake of the governors and the governed. It was necessary for the governors because "the political axiom so often acted upon by Asiatic Princes, that the more a people are kept in darkness, their rulers will derive the greater advantages from them since, by reference to history it is found that this was but a short-sighted policy which did not ultimately answer the purpose of its authors. On the contrary, it rather proved disadvantageous to them; for we find that as often as an ignorant people, when an opportunity offers, revolted against their Rulers, all sorts of barbarous excesses and cruelties have been the consequence." Again, "And when placed under a good Government from which they experience just and liberal treatment must become the more attached to it in proportion as they become enlightened." The Raja pointed out that the argument that the spread of knowledge is

dangerous to the existence of all legitimate authority because "as a people become enlightened, they will discover that by a unity of effort the many may easily shake off the yoke of the few and thus become emancipated from the restraints of power altogether" is countered by the lesson derived from history that "the resistance of a people advanced in knowledge has ever been—not against the existence—but against the abuses of the governing power."

The freedom of expression was necessary for the governed because it was "an invauable privilege firmly secured to us by the laws of the land which we had so long enjoyed and could not be charged with ever having abused." A free press was a safety valve. If there is a free press, the grounds of discontent that excite revolution are removed. Where there is no freedom of the press and grievances remain unrepresented and unredressed, revolutions take place in all parts of the world. A free press is also necessary to improve the minds of the people and also their general condition. However, the Raja was not against restraints on the right of the freedom of the press. He admitted that restraints other than those which were imposed in England might be necessary in India in order to punish those who might endeavour to excite hatred in the minds of the natives of India against the English people. He also was agreeable to a provision which punishes those who seditiously attempted to excite hostilities with neighbouring or friendly states. The Raja was not against restraints legally inflicted but he was against the introduction of arbitrary restrictions which were unwarranted by the circumstances in India. He was opposed to the restraints imposed by the British bureaucracy in India to substitute their own pleasure for the laws of England. The demand of the Raja for the freedom of the press in India was also a plea for the establishment of the rule of law in place of the rule of persons. In his memorial on the freedom of the press presented to the King-in-Council, the Raja observed thus regarding the restrictions imposed on the freedom of the press: "Either the Government does not intend to put them in force at all, or it is anxious to interrupt the regular course of justice, abolish the right of trial by jury and taking the law into its own hands, combine the legislative and judicial power which is destructive of all civil liberty."

Law

According to the Raja, both custom and command of the sacred writings are the sources of law, but he did not identify either with law itself. In his "Essay on the Rights of Hindus Over Ancestral Property", the Raja observed, "In every country, rules determining tho rights of succession to and alienation of property first originated in the conventional choice of the people, or in the discretion of the highest authority, secular or spiritual and these rules have been subsequently established by the common usage of the country and confirmed by judicial proceedings.' The Raja accepted both custom and command of the sovereign as the essential ingredients of law-making.

The view of the Raja contained the essential truth of both the Analytical and Historical Schools of jurisprudence. Historically speaking a law might have originated either in the choice of the people or in the command

of the sovereign, but in order to stand the test of time it must have been subsequently accepted by the people and enshrined in common usage.

The Raja admitted the right of the supreme authority to make whatever alteration or modification it thought fit. However, he insisted that the long-standing customs of India should not be lightly set aside. If the people had followed a particuar custom for centuries in contravention of the authority of some of the sacred writers, the legislators should not attempt to restore the authority of those writers in utter disregard of the long standing custom of the people. The opinion of the Raja was that the people must have found that custom reasonable and "calculated to promote their social interest" on the ground that they would not have followed it for such a long time. The Raja advocated adherence to those customs only which satisfied two important conditions. Those must be reasonable and must conduce to the general welfare of the people.

Laws for India

During the times of the Raja, there were three classes of Regulations in India. The first were the Rules, Ordinanecs and Regulations passed by the Government in the time of George III. Those Regulations were not valid until they were registered by the Supreme Court. They were then sent to England and exhibited at the India House. Any party could appeal against them within 60 days. The King might disallow any Regulation.

The second class of Regulations were those which related to the Government of places outside Calcutta and were known as Rules and Regulations for the provinces. The authorities in England could disapprove of those Regulations.

The third class of Regulations had reference to the imposition of taxes and duties by the Governor and they were not valid until approved by the Court of Directors and Board of Commissioners.

There were two schools of thought regarding the legislative authority of India. The view of one school was that India must be governed in India through a Legislative Council. The view of the other school was that the British Parliament should continue to be the supreme legislative authority over India as India was still not fit to make laws for herself.

The Raja was against the plan of vesting legislative authority in the hands of the Government of India. The laws were the commands of the sovereign and the Governor-General was not the supreme ruler. The sovereign power over India was the King-in-Parliament and hence the Raja demanded that the laws for India should be made by the King-in-Parliament. The Raja entertained a very high opinion of the disinterestedness and philanthropy of the public men of England. Hence he opposed the assumption of legislative authority by any servant of the English East India Company, however high and exalted his position might be.

The Raja believed in the theory of separation of powers and he was prepared to go on any length to secure its observance. He believed that if a legislative council was set up in India, it would be dominated by the executive authority and could never rise above passion or prejudice against a class or a sect. Hence he thought that it was better to rely on the enlight-

ened public opinion of England than to be governed by bureaucratic legislature.

The Raja was fully conscious of the difficulty of making laws from England for a distant country at a time when the means of communication had not developed. He suggested three methods for ensuring good laws for India. The first method was the free press. The freedom of the press was necessary for making good laws for India. The people should have the power of placing before the Government their opinion on matters affecting the general interest of the community. The Government should have some means of knowing the sentiments of the people and that was possible by the freedom of the press. The people would be able to ventilate their grievances through the press and try to have them redressed. The free press would obviate the danger of a revolution. Through the press, the people will be able to appeal to the honour and justice of the British nation against any possible oppressive and tyrannical act of the Government of India. It would also help the Court of Directors to ascertain correctly whether the systems introduced in their possessions were proved to be beneficial to the people of India.

The second method suggested by the Raja for securing good laws for India was the appointment of Commissions of Inquiry from time to time. The members of those Commissions of Inquiry were to be gentlemen of intelligence and respectability totally unconnected with the governing body in India. These Commissions were to investigate on the spot the condition of the people of India and judge with their own eyes regarding the operation of the systems of law and jurisprudence under which they lived. The Raja preferred the method of the free press to the Commissions of Inquiry. The third method suggested by the Raja was to ascertain the opinion of the aristocracy of wealth and intellect in India regarding any proposed legislation. The view of the Raja was that not only the public functionaries but also the intelligent and wealthy members of the public should be consulted before making any law.

According to the Raja, the power of initiative in legislation should belong to the Indian Government, that of criticism to the Indian public and officials and the power of enacting laws to the British Parliament.

Law and Morality

The Raja made a distinction between law and morality in 1830, two years before the same thing was done by Austin in 1832. In 1830, the Raja published the "Essay on the Rights of Hindoos over Ancestral Property according to the law of Bengal." He also published some letters in the newspaper named 'Harkaru'. The Raja upheld the right of the father to sell or mortgage the ancestral property without consulting his sons. He maintained that such an absolute ownership of property had been the customary law of Bengal since the time of Jimutavahana, the author of the Dayabhaga. The view of Jimutavahana was that the "texts of Vyasa exhibiting the prohibition, are intended to show a moral offence; since the family is distressed by a sale or other transfer which augurs a disposition in the person to make an ill use of his power as owner. They are not meant to invalidate the sale or other transfer." While explaining this statement,

the Raja pointed out the areas covered by law and morality. According to the Raja, some of the moral precepts are also legally binding, but not all of them. Likewise, some of the laws are based on moral principles but not all of them. However, an immoral law is as valid and binding as moral law. A law must be obeyed whether it is moral or not. The Raja pointed out that scriptural precepts and prohibitions were sometimes received as morally and legally binding such as prohibiting divorce of a wife without infidelity on her part and prohibiting oaths of all kinds both morally and legally. In some instances, they were received as inculcating only moral duty.

A writer in the Calcutta Quarterly Magazine wrote in 1825 that any disposal by a father of his ancestral immoveable property should be nullified on the principle that we ought "to make that invalid which is considered immoral". The Raja criticized that view by giving illustrations which made a distinction between law and morality. To quote him, "To permit the sale of intoxicating drugs and spirits so injurious to health and sometimes destructive of life, on the payment of duties publicly levied, is an act highly irreligious and immoral: Is the taxation to be, therefore, rendered invalid and payment stopped? To divide spoils gained in a war commenced in ambition and carried on with cruelty, is an act immoral and irreligious: Is the partition therefore to be considered invalid and the property to be replaced? To give a daughter in marriage to an unworthy man on account of his rank or fortune or other such consideration, is a deed of mean and immoral example; Is the union to be therefore considered invalid and their children illegitimate? To destroy the life of a fellow being in a duel is not only immoral but is reckoned by many as murder: Is not the practice tacitly admitted to be legal by the manner in which it is overlooked in courts of justice? The question then arises how shall we draw a line of distinction between those immoral acts which should not be considered invalid and those that should be considered invalid and those that should be regarded as null in the eye of the law? In answer to this we must refer to the common law and the established usages of every country as furnishing the distinctions admitted between the one class and the other."

It is clear from above that the Raja knew the distinction between law and morality in 1830 when he wrote his Essay on the rights of the Hindus over ancestral property according to the law of Bengal. This is described as a "capital discovery" of the Raja although credit is given to John Austin for making the distinction in his book which was published in 1832. Moreover, the theory of the Raja about the spheres of law and morality is much more explicit than the utilitarian doctrine of Bentham who only emphasized that the existence of a law is no justification of it unless it agrees with the greatest good of all. Any possibility of the Raja influencing either Bentham or Austin in this regard is completely ruled out not only because Austin had prepared his lectures much before they were published in 1832 but also because the Raja himself admits that he was aware that the British legislators did not believe in the maxim that we ought to make that invalid which was considered immoral.

The Raja does not make secret of the fact that he borrowed the distinction between law and morality from Hindu legislators of repute. He re-

ferred to the texts of Vyas and also the author of the Dayabhaga to show that a thing may be immoral and still not illegal. He pointed out that the author of the Dayabhaga had followed the path frequently inculcated by Manu and others. The influence of Hindu legislators who saw the distinction between the spheres of law and morality, is obvious on the Raja.

State and Economic Activity

The Raja believed in the institution of individual property but he was not a strict individualist. His view was that it was the duty of the Government to protect the weak and the helpless against the oppression of the strong. He maintained that the benefits of Permanent Settlement should be extended to the cultivators, the farmers and labourers in every part of the country. He did not believe that the direct management of land by the Government could be efficient. To quote him, "The temporary increase of revenue to Government under its own management would also have soon fallen off through the misconduct and negligence of the revenue officers as shown by innumerable intsances in which estates were kept Khas, i.e., under the immediate management of Government." The Raja also held that "every man is entitled by law and reason to enjoy the fruits of his honest labour and good management."

The view of the Raja was that it was the duty of the Government to protect the helpless cultivators against the powerful zamindars and the Hindu females against the oppression of their male relatives. His contention was that the Government had declared in 1793 that it was its right and duty to protect the cultivators but actually it had done nothing to protect them. The Raja was moved with pity on seeing the wretched condition of the cultivators under the Zamindari and Ryotwari settlement. To quote him, "In short, such is the melancholy condition of the agricultural labourers that it always gives me the greatest pain to allude to it." The Raja suggested that the Zamindars should not be allowed to increase the rent by law. This suggestion was against the prevailing practice which entitled the Zamindar to increase the rent to be got from the cultivator. The Raja justified his suggestion on the ground that "an unjust precedent and practice, even of long standing, cannot be considered as the standard of justice by an enlightened Government". The Raja appealed to the Government to lower its demand upon the Zamindar and thereby enable the Zamindar to reduce the rent of the cultivators in the same proportion. He made certain suggestions for making up the loss of the Government. He asked the Government to levy a tax on luxuries and "such articles of use and consumption as are not necessaries of life." Another suggestion was to reduce the expenses of the revenue establishment. That could be done by employing Indians in place of Europeans in that Department. The Indians could be employed on lower wages. He also suggested the substitution of a militia force for the standing army. The view of the Raja was that the permanent settlement with the cultivators would make them so much attached to the British Government that it would not be neccessary to maintain a standing army. Out of gratitude and self-interest, the people of India would be ready to sacrifice their lives and property in defence of the English East India Company.

The Raja endorsed the view that there was a regular drain of wealth from India every year and that made the people poor. In order to check the economic drain from India, he suggested that the Europeans accumulating capital in India should be encouraged to settle in India so that the wealth may not go out of India. The Raja was convinced that with an increase in our relations with European gentlemen, there will be an improvement in literary, social and political affairs in India. While advocating the colonization of India by Europeans, the Raja did not suggest that the ordinary labourers of England should come to India and cultivate the land. He did not want European labour but welcomed only European skill and capital. He asked those Europeans to come and settle in India who by their superior knowledge and public spirit, would elevate the character of the people and bring about the industrial regeneration of India. The Raja hoped that the Europeans would introduce better methods of agriculture and also make improvements in mechanical arts. They would teach the people how to secure political rights. They would secure better administration of the country by representing the grievances of India to the authorities in England. It might be contended that such a policy may ultimately lead to a revolt in India as it happened in the case of the United States, but the contention of the Raja was that the people of the American colonies were driven to rebellion by mis-government and if that had not been so, they would not have revolted. In support of his view, the Raja gave the example of Canada. Moreover, even if such a thing happened and there was a separation between India and England, still a friendly and highly adantageous commercial intercourse would be kept between India and England.

State and Social Activity

The Raja did not believe in a policy of *laissez faire*. As a matter of fact, he asked for the help of the Government to improve the moral, social, cultural and political condition of India. According to the Raja, the Government should "promote a more liberal and enlightened system of instruction, embracing Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Anatomy with other useful sciences." The Raja carried on a crusade for the abolition of the Sati system and ultimately the practice of Sati was declared illegal and punishable as culpable homicide in December 1829.

The Raja was a champion of the rights of women. In 1822, he wrote a book in which he pleaded for the abrogation of the new doctrine which limited the rights of women in favour of the older liberal views. By referring to the ancient law-givers, the Raja tried to prove that the daughters were entitled to one-fourth part of the portion which was given to the son.

The Raja also called upon the Government to take positive action to regulate the custom of taking a second wife during the life-time of the first. To quote him, "Had a magistrate or other public officer been authorised by the rulers of the Empire to receive applications for his sanction to a second marriage during the life of the first wife and to grant his consent only on such accusations as the foregoing being substantiated, the above law might have been rendered effectual and the distress of the female sex in Bengal and the number of suicides would have been necessarily very much reduced."

The Raja was of the view that women were not inferior to men in any way. To quote him, "As you keep women generally devoid of education and acquirements, you cannot, therefore, in justice pronounce on their inferiority.'

Form of Government

The view of the Raja was that in order to preserve the lives and properties of the people from the attacks of their fellow citizens and to form friendly relations with neighbouring states and resist the aggressions of nations which aim at aggrandising themselves on the ruin of others, it was absolutely necessary that every nation should have some kind of Government. The Raja was opposed to direct democracy as many persons in a community would be totally ignorant of the rules and principles of Government and may try to seek their private interest at the cost of general welfare. He was also opposed to a monarch with unlimited powers. The Raja criticized absolute monarchy in these words: "How is it possible that the lives and properties of hundreds of thousands of the sons of Adam should be made dependent on the will of one man and ready to be sacrificed to the caprices of a single individual! It is equivalent to bringing upon themselves the nature and condition of brute animals. For the best of men are not supposed to be free from passion and immoderate desires which very often overcome the dictates of reason or exempted from those errors and vices which belong to human nature. And, consequently, in the case of an absolute monarchy, from the wrath or mistake of a single individual may proceed the destruction of an extensive country and ruin of great nation."

The Raja was also against the rule of a few or some people from the general body. To quote him, "The unlimited influence of a great body of men out of a people in the Government of a country, produces discontent and degradation in the rest and occasions disunion in the nation. Therefore, the third species of Government, that is, aristocracy is calculated to introduce both the evils that may arise from absolute monarchy and democracy."

The Raja was in favour of a limited or constitutional monarchy. To quote him, "As it is absolutely necessary to have some form of Government, the executive power should be committed to a single individual on the condition that he does not infringe the laws established by the nation; which has been experienced to be the best of all forms of Government, since in this case the subjects have the power of watching the proceedings of the executive Government which is thus obliged to court the goodwill of its subjects."

Humanism and Universal Religion

In the world torn with various conflicts, the Raja set a lofty example of cosmopolitan thinking and humanitarian endeavour. He did nothing in which there was not some benefit to the whole human community. He recognised individualism, nationalism and internationalism and their respective claims. Both in India and abroad, he pleaded for the freedom and fullest development of all so that the whole of mankind may share the benefits. In the words of Sir Brajendranath Seal, "Raja Rammohan Roy was

the cosmopolite, the rationalist thinker, the representative of Men with a universal outlook on human civilisation and its historic march, a Brahmin of the Brahmins; Jeremy Bentham's admired and dearly loved collaborator in the service of mankind; the peer of the Humes, the Gibbons, the Voltaires, the Volneys, the Diderots, or any free thinkers or Rationalists of them all. For him all idols were broken, and the parent of all illusions, Authority, had been hacked to pieces. He, the cosmopolite, was daunted by no speculative doubts, discouraged by no craven fears. For him the veil of Isis was torn, the temple had been rent in twain, and Holy of Holies lay bare to his gaze. Calmly, fearlessly, truthfully, he probed, fathomed, dissected. The Raja was no doctrinaire. He had a wholesome historical instinct, a love of concrete embodiments and institutions, such as characterised the born religious and social reformer. A rationalist and universalist in every pulse of his being, he was no believer in the cult of the worship of Reason, of naked logical abstraction. The universal guiding principle of the love of God and man, he sought and found in the Scriptures of the nations, and rose from the barren religion of Nature or Theophilanthropy of his eighteenth century predecessors to a liberal interpretation and acceptance of the Historic Revelation and Scriptures, not indeed in any supernatural sense, but as embodiments of the collective sense, of races of mankind, and as concentrating and focussing that principle of Authority which, in this mundane state, is an indispensable cement and foundation, an elementary factor of communal life, whether in the social, political, or religious sphere. Thus rationalistic Raja has verily been the founder and father of the nineteenth century conception of the Scriptures which discards supernaturalism and miracle-mongering, and yet returns and reassures for the race those precious treasures, those storehouses of moral and spiritual force, and of living authority."

The Raja sincerely believed that India should bring the whole structure of her own civilisation into line with modern requirements. His passion for truth sometimes ignored the passion of his own countrymen for their faiths, but he sincerely stood not only for the welfare of India but also for the people of other countries of the world.

The Raja was a champin of the noble ideal of international cooperation. He made the following prayer to the Supreme Being : "May God render religion destructive of differences and dislike between man and man and conducive to the peace and union of mankind."

In his letter written to the French Foreign Minister in 1832, the Raja suggested the establishment of a Congress for the settlement of political and commercial disputes. He subscribed to the doctrine of universal sympathy.

About Raja Rammohan Roy, Prof. Max Muller wrote : "The Raja was the first to complete a connected life-current between the East and the West—the inspired engineer in the world of faith that cut the channel of communication, the spiritual Suez between sea and sea landlocked in the rigid sectarianism of exclusive revelation, and set their separate surges of national life into one mighty world-current of universal humanity".

Educational Ideas

In 1823, the Raja protested against the establishment of a Sanskrit

College by the British Government in India and demanded instead that the College might be utilised for imparting a liberal and enlightened system of instruction through the medium of English. In his letter to Lord Amherst on English education, the Raja wrote, "The Sanskrit system of education would be best calculated to keep this country in darkness if such had been the policy of the British legislature. But as the improvement of the native population is the object of the Government, it will consequently promote a more liberal and enlightened system of instruction, embracing Mathematics, Natural Philosophy, Chemistry, Anatomy with other useful sciences which may be accomplished with the sums proposed by employing a few gentlemen of talent and learning educated in Europe and providing a College furnished with necessary books, instruments and other apparatus".

His Attitude Towards Traditionalism

The view of Dr. B. B. Majumdar is that Raja Rammohan Roy was always anxious to call himself a Hindu and he wanted to carry the people with him in the matter of social reform. He also wanted to show that his programme of social and religious reform could be supported from the old texts of the scriptures of the Hindus. His view was that while dealing with the masses, the method of using the authority of the scriptures for justifying a particular reform would be more effective. He used the rich heritage of Kabir, Chaitanya, Ramanuja and Ramanand to spread his views on monotheism and human brotherhood. He tried to assimilate the new values created by Western science and rationalism and to blend with the traditional values of India in order to meet the challenge of the new age. He regarded society as an organic whole and social reform as an integral part of the development of national tradition. His view was that social reform was intimately connected with political reform. To quote Raja Rammohan Roy, "I regret to say that the present system of religion adhered to by the Hindus is not calculated to promote their political interests. The distinction of castes, introducing innumerable divisions and sub-divisions among them has entirely deprived them of political feeling and the multitude of religious rites and ceremonies and the laws of purification have totally disqualified them from undertaking any difficult enterprise. It is, I think, necessary that some changes should take place in their religion at least for the sake of their political advantage and social comfort".

The Raja wrote a pamphlet in 1822 in which he showed how the ancient rights of the females according to the Hindu law of inheritance had been encroached upon in recent times. The Raja maintained that the recent theories and practices which limited the right of women to inherit property should be abrogated and the old view regarding the same be adopted. The Raja cited passages from Manu, Yajnavalkya and Katyayana to show that daughters in ancient India were entitled to one-fourth of the share given to sons.

The Raja was the first great Indian reformer to advocate a plan for breaking down the barriers of the caste system by introducing inter-caste marriages and he cited authorities from the Hindu scriptures in support of his view. He justified widow remarriage, inter-caste marriage and inter-racial marriages on the basis of the Saiva tradition. The Raja was opposed

by the Hindu priests and Christian missionaries but he continued his programme and in due course of time got more and more disciples. Romain Rolland writes about the Raja, "He was no more chained to orthodox Christianity than to orthodox Hinduism, although he believed that he had discovered its real meaning. He remained an independent theist, essentially a rationalist and moralist. He extracted from Christianity its ethical system but he rejected the divinity of Christ just as he rejected Hindu incarnations. As a passionate unitarian, he attacked the trinity no less than polytheism and hence both Brahmans and missionaries were united against him".

His Attitude Towards Modernisation

The Raja was a modern thinker. He welcomed the British rule in India as it had the effect of modernising Indian society. Security of life and property was established by the Government of India. The upper classes in India became familiar with Western sciences and the English language and literature and they became liberalized and modernized in their outlook

The Raja analysed the causes which were responsible for the defeat of the Indians at the hands of the foreigners and his conclusion was that every effort must be made to modernise the Indian society, economy and policy in the light of the new situation and circumstances. The Raja advocated the codification of laws in India and considered the same to be very important. He emphasized the fact that the legal code for India should conform to the customs and traditions of India as far as possible without violating the basic norms of rationality and social usefulness. He advocated the modernisation of the legal system in India but the Indian tradition was not to be ignored altogether.

The Raja and Indian Renaissance

The view of Sushobhan Sarkar is that the part played by Bengal in the social and political regeneration of India can be compared to the position ocupied by Italy in the history of European Renaissance and the Raja was the pioneer in the Bengal Renaissance. He was fully conscious of the decadent and corrupt condition of the social structure in India and compared the same with the healthy and progressive society and civilisation of the West. This does not mean that he condemned the rational and valuable aspects of the ancient Indian heritage. He was inspired by deep love for the Indian people whose degraded condition he wanted to improve. He was very critical of institutionalized Hinduism which stood in the way of the progress of the society. His view was that while fighting against idol worship, caste divisions and other social evils, he was purifying the old Hindu religion. Actually, he was preparing the foundation for a new religious ideology and new social relations suited to the development of a new society in the country. The Indian Renaissance started by the Raja was progressive, anti-feudal and anti-colonialist. He is rightly regarded as the father of modern Indian socialism. He represented the liberal spirit of his times. He was not living in an ivory tower. He was surrounded by close associates, comrades and admirers. It is true that he was attacked by the followers of the young Bengal movement on the ground that he had

ultra radical views but he continued to work unmindful of the agitation and criticism. Men like Ranade got their inspiration from Raja Rammohan Roy.

Father of Indian Liberalism

Raja Rammohan Roy was a great Indian liberal leader. He was the predecessor of the Liberal movement during the nineteenth century in India. He had a passion for liberty. He advocated the right to property and freedom of contract. His contention was that the "validity of existing titles to property should not be disturbed nor the conracts founded on the received interpretation of the law should be violated by the Government." However, he did not believe in the policy of *Laissez faire*. He wanted the state to interfere to protect the tenants from excesses of the landlords and the Hindu women from the tyranny of the social customs. He pointed out that at the time of the Permanent Settlement of Bengal the Government had declared that it was its right and duty to protect the cultivators from their hopeless situation and he wanted the Government to stop any further increase of rent by the landlords on any pretext whatsoever. He congratulated Lord William Bentinck for his abolition of the custom of Sati among the Hindus.

The Raja encouraged industry. He was the champion of cooperation, toleration, fellowship and cosmopolitanism. The liberalism of the Raja was elaborated by Ranade who expressed his debt to the Raja. The members of the National Liberal Federation of India acknowledged the Raja as the "Father of Modern India". V. N. Naik wrote about the Raja, "Himself a devout worshipper at the shrine of liberty, he realised even so far back as 1820 that liberty to be properly enjoyed must be regulated liberty, that freedom has its own restraints as much as order. In the field of social and religious reform, no less than in journalism and politics, his one endeavour was to awaken his countrymen not only to their rights as free men but also to their obligations to society." (Indian Liberalism, p. 1).

His Attitude Towards British Rule

To begin with, the Raja had hatred for the British rule in India but later on he started praising the British rule in the country. As a matter of fact, he came to believe that the continuation of British rule in India will help the people of India to make progress. The Raja himself wrote in November 1823, "Among other subjects in our solemn devotion, we frequently offer our humble thanks to God for the blessings of British rule in India and sincerely pray that it may continue in its beneficent operation for centuries to come." It may look paradoxical that the man who is called the architect of modern India and advocate of the independence of Greece and Naples, praised the British rule in India to the skies and wanted the same to be continued. The Raja was neither a martyr nor a prophet of Swaraj. He praised the British rule in India when the Marathas and the Sikhs were fighting against it. That is why it is contended that it is not proper to call him the Prophet of India's political freedom. However, it may be pointed out that the Raja did not want the continuation of British rule in India for ever. He merely praised the Englishmen for what they had done for the betterment of Indian society.

Raja Rammohan Roy symbolized renascent spirit of new India. He had to fight hard against the social and religious decadence and ignorance and superstition in India. He struggled hard to modernise India both intellectually and spiritually. He gave a modern meaning and purpose to the ancient and medieval elements of Indian polity. He brought about a synthesis of the East and the West which led to a cosmopolitan humanist culture. He was both oriental and occidental in his outlook. He is called the first Oriental Occidentalist of modern India. He tried to combine the best in Indian culture with the best in Western culture. Miss Collet writes, "Whatever future the destinies may have in store for India, that future will be largely shaped by the life and work of Rammohan Roy."

SUGGESTED READINGS

Amal Home : *Ram Mohan Roy.*

Ball, Upendranath : *Ram Mohan Roy : A Study of his Life, Work and Thought*, Calcutta, 1933.

Chatterjee, Ramamand : *Ram Mohan Roy and Modern India*, 1918.

Collet, S.D. : *The Life and Letters of Raja Rammohun Roy*, London, 1900.

Commemoration Volume of Ram Mohan Roy Centenary Celebrations, 1935.

Damodaran, K. : *Indian Thought—A Critical Survey*, Bombay, 1967.

Dasgupta, B.N. : *The Life and Times of Raja Rammohan Roy*, New Delhi, 1959.

Ganguly, Nalin : *Ram Mohan Roy*, 1939.

Iqbal Singh : *Ram Mohan Roy*, 1961.

Karunakaran, K.P. : *Indian Political Tradition*, New Delhi, 1976.

Majumdar, B.B. : *History of Indian Social and Political Ideas from Rammohan to Dayanand*, Calcutta, 1967.

Mazumdar, J.K. : *Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Progressive Movements in India*, Calcutta, 1941.

Majumdar, R.C. : *On Rammohun Roy*, Calcutta, 1972.

Nag, Jamuna : *Raja Rammohun Roy*, 1972.

Nag, K. and Burman, D. (Eds.) : *The English Works of Raja Ram Mohun Roy*, 5 Parts, Calcutta, 1945-48.

Parekh, C. Manilal : *Brahmo Samaj*, 1929.

Rolland, Romain : *The Life of Ramakrishna.*

Roy, Raja Rammohun : *Selected Works*, New Delhi, 1977.

Seal, Sir Brijendra Nath : *Rammohun Roy, The Universal Man.*

Sen, A.C. : *Raja Ram Mohun Roy.*

Tagore, S.N. : *Raja Ram Mohun Roy.*

CHAPTER III

Swami Dayanand (1824-1883)

In the words of Dr. Shanta Malhotra, Smami Dayanand occupies a unique position in the history of Indian thought. He was in fact a Smritikara of modern India. He was the first Indian thinker in modern times who propounded original ideas on political, administrative, social, economic and religious problems of his age. His social ideas regarding caste system, untouchability, child marriage, widow remarriage, education of women and equal rights for men and women have been generally accepted. His economic thought was based on the principle of compulsory education for all, equal opportunity to all children for getting education and to get work according to their Varna (capacity to work), and his concept of changing heirs and sons which implies the concept of trusteeship in property. On the basis of his ideas on philosophy, religion and metaphysics, he is acclaimed to be a great seer and a religious leader. He is recognised as the pioneer of Indian national movement as he was the first to put forward the ideals of nationalism, Swarajya and Swadeshi. Besides being a social reformer and a religious leader, he was a political thinker also and his contribution in that field is really important and original. He can be placed with thinkers like Manu, Shukra, Chanakya and Kamandaka so far as Indian polity is concerned. He put forth some original political ideas after the lapse of about twelve centuries in the history of India. There was no original political thought prior to Dayanand in modern and medieval India. Even Raja Ram Mohan Roy who is called the Morning Star of the Indian renaissance, did not put forth any new political thought. It was only in the beginning of the twentieth century that some new thinking started in this field under the influence of Western education. Dayanand was a pioneer in the field of social and political thinking in modern India. Though he did not write a separate treatise on politics and his ideas lie scattered in his various works, his contribution to political thought is in no way less important than that of ancient political thinkers of India and Greece or modern scholars of the West. (Political Thought of Swami Dayanand, pp. 17-20).

The original name of Swami Dayanand was Mool Shankar. He was born in 1824 at Tankara in the petty state of Morvi in Kathiawar in modern Gujarat. His well-to-do father instructed him in Sanskrit and Shaivism from the age of 5. The young boy was of a rebellious temperament. Doubts arose in his mind on a Shivratri night and those brought him into conflict with his father on the question of idol worship. He was hardly 14 at that time. In order to avoid marriage and also to satisfy his inner doubts, he ran away from home at the age of 19 and became a Sanyasi (a religious mendicant). He spent the next 15 years of his life as a wandering ascetic in search of knowledge. His search took him to

the Himalayas, the Vindhyas and the Aravalis and across the valley and along the banks of the Ganges, Jamuna and Narmada rivers. He acquired a mastery of the Sanskrit language, its grammar, philosophy and religious literature. In 1860, he went to Mathura where he read the sacred books from Swami Virjanand Saraswati who was an intellectual giant. He found in him a true Guru and guide. He read with him for nearly four years.

The twenty years from 1864 to 1883 were a period of very hard wark for Swami Dayanand. He travelled all over India. He entered into religious debates with great scholars in various parts of the country. In 1875, he established the first Arya Samaj at Bombay and a similar Arya Samaj was set up at Lahore in June 1877. He set up Arya Samajas wherever he went. In February 1883, he established the Paropkarini Sabha at Ajmer to guide the activities of the Arya Samajists all over the country. He went to Jodhpur in May 1883. He was poisoned and he died on 30 October 1883 at Ajmer.

The political and social ideas of Swami Dayanand are to be found in the various books written by him such as Satyartha Prakash, Rigvedadibhashya Bhoomika, Rigvedabhashya (Commentary on the Rigveda), Yajurvedabhashya (Commentary on the Yajurveda), Vyavaharbhanu, Updesha Manjari (Collection of the lectures of Dayanand at Poona), Aryabhivinaya, Swamantavya Prakash and Swami Dayanand Ke Patra Aur Vigyapan (Letters and Proclamations) edited by Bhagwat Datta.

The State

Swami Dayanad did not propound any theory regarding the origin of the state. He was merely concerned with the character of a fully organised state. According to him, the purposes of the state are the promotion of righteousness, dispensation of justice, destruction of the wicked, welfare of the people and attainment of the ultimate aim of human existence (Moksha). The end of the state is to secure enlightenment, independence, piety, sound education and material prosperity.

According to Dayanand, that Government is good which is analogous to God's Government of the universe, i.e., is based on justice, righteousness and truthfulness. He was a protagonist of divine kingdom on earth based on justice, righteousness and truthfulness. In this, he resembles Mahatma Gandhi to some extent. However, his concept of an ideal state differs from that of Mahatma Gandhi who believed in the final elimination of coercive power of the state by constant observance of non-violence in political action. In his ideal state, Gandhiji ruled out the necessity of police, armed forces, law courts etc. According to him, a state of enlightened anarchy is perfect. In such a state, social and corpoarte life becomes self-regulated and the Government becomes unnecessary. However, Dayanad realised the necessity of Danda (force or power) and gave due importance to the might of the state and the power of Government in his ideal state. To quote him, "In order to be the ruler or the members of the state assembly, they must learn traditional Dandaniti from those who are well-versed in all the four Vedas". While holding this view, Dayanand was in line with ancient Indian thinkers who gave great importance to Dand in society.

In Chapter VI of his book 'Satyartha Prakash', Dayanand posed the question as to who is a ruler in the true sense and answers thus: "It is

Danda who is the real ruler, the real leader, the administrator of justice, the actual governor, and is the custodian of the four Varnas and Ashramas. (1) Danda governs the people and protects them all. Danda wakes while men are asleep. That is why the wise men hold that Danda alone is Dharma. (2) Righteously wielded, Danda gives happiness to all; thoughtlessly applied, on the other hand, it ruins the king completely. (3) Without the enforcement of Danda, all the Varnas shall be defiled and all propriety upset. Inconsistency in Danda would destroy the whole people. (4) Danda is death itself, a black giant with blood-shot eyes, ever on a lookout to punish the guilty. Where this giant rules, i.e., where a king is learned and unprejudicial, able to wield this powerful Danda righteously, there reigns happiness and people never in dejection complain. (5) Only such a king should wield the sceptre who will never warp or transgress facts, never pronounce judgement without having all the pros and cons and execute plans always with a view to developing nation's character (piety), welfare and economy. (6) The king who administers Danda properly succeeds in fostering threefold advancement of life, i.e., piety, enjoyment and plenty. A sensual, defective, mean and jealous king is crushed by Danda itself. (7) Danda is a fire which men lacking in intellect and integrity can ill contain. Let the king slip one whit from the path of rectitude, and the path next leads all of him along with his kith and kin fast to destruction. (8) Danda is incapable of being administered with justice and equity by fools, by those who are not assisted by experts, who are devoid of knowledge and good education and who are engrossed in sensualism. (9) Danda can be wielded by him alone who is of pure heart, who is of righteous conduct and associates with righteous persons, who acts in accordance with the dictates of scriptures, who enjoys the confidence and support of good men and who is wise. Further, he says, "Danda administered justly is the real ruler and the real Dharma."

According to Dayanand, the state is one of the associations of the community, although it is the most important association. There are three other associations viz., Rajya Sabha, Vidya Sabha and Dharam Sabha. The Rajya Sabha looks after the political interests of the people and especially conducts all affairs relating to the state. The Vidya Sabha cultivates and propagates arts and sciences. The Dharam Sabha preaches religion and morality and checks unrighteousness. The highly learned people should be elected to the Vidya Sabha. Learned and pious men should be elected to Dharam Sabha. Famous and pious should form the Rajya Sabha. So far as the general interests are concerned, each Sabha should be dependent on others, but in their respective spheres of activity, each should function independently. Swami Dayanand would allow autonomy to educational and religious bodies. To quote him, "Let each discuss and decide subjects that concern it." Normally, the Political Assembly should not interfere with the decisions arrived at by the Educational and Religious Assemblies. However, the Political Assembly cannot hold itself totally aloof in educational and religious matters.

The members of the Vidya Sabha, Dharam Sabha and the Rajya Sabha must belong to the orders of Brahmacharis, Grihasthas and Vanaprasthis and not of Sanyasis. The members of the Sabhas must be conversant with the four Vedas and the science of religion. They must also be keen logi-

cians and masters of language. The Swami warns against the appointment of ignorant fools to these assemblies.

According to Dayanand, the Government is the agent of the community. Its duty is to provide security against internal and external dangers and also to promote the highest aims of human life. According to him, it is the duty of the king and other good and learned men to examine all men thoroughly and then place every one of them into one of the four classes—Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaisya and Sudra—according to his qualifications and merits. It is the duty of the state to provide vocational guidance to all children.

Dayanand recognises the necessity of allowing citizens to hold private property. He believes in inequality of the division of wealth. However, the rich are to utilise their wealth in making the life of the poor better and happier.

Dayanand puts great emphasis on the maintenance of a strong army as there is no other way of maintaining independence of the state. As professional soldiers alone are not sufficient for the protection of the state against external aggression, he advises the government to impart military training to all the subjects.

According to Dayanand, the primary duty of the government is to enhance the national wealth. He condemns that Government which does not do so. According to him, the Government is the guardian and protector of those who are not able to earn their livelihood either because of disease and infirmity or because they are too young to take care of themselves. It is also the duty of the ruler and other responsible persons to see that all the four classes or Varnas discharge their duties faithfully. Dayanad entrusts the function of regulating marriage customs to the government. The government should make laws with a view to ensuring social happiness. It is the duty of the government to prohibit early marriage, polygamy and polyandry.

Form of Government

According to Dayanand, no human being can occupy the position of a king. God is the only king whom all should obey. Only that state prospers in which people firmly believe that all-powerful God is the protector of the people, that He is the bestower of knowledge and happiness and that He alone is the king in all respects.

Dayanand was against the rule by one man. In the Satyarth Prakash, he writes that absolute power should not be entrusted to one man. An autocratic king never allows others to be equal to himself. His own personality over-shadows that of others. He would somehow or other rob and unjustly punish those who would show the least sign of prosperity. Where one man is obeyed as king, all the subjects are condemned to live in misery. Such a king is called the murderer of subjects because out of his greed, he destroys the substance of the subjects.

However, Dayanand recognised the necessity of having a President for representing the unity of the state. That President is to be elected by the people. The right of ruling the people is to be conferred by the people

themselves. The man who is learned, pious, highly spoken of by judges, whose conduct satisfies all the subjects, should be obeyed as President. The candidate for Presidentship should be thoroughly examined first. If he is found to be highly learned and righteous, with a disposition to do good to all, he should be elected as President of the state.

According to Dayanand, the President must be powerful like electricity. He should be as dear as air or one's own life to the people. He should be as impartial as Yama, the King of Death. Like the Sun, he should dispel the darkness of ignorance and make manifest learning, justice and piety. Like Agni, he should destroy the wicked. Like the moon, he should administer to the happiness of the people. Like Kubera, he should be able to fill up the treasury.

Dayanand was in favour of a republican form of Government. A Republic might be an oligarchy or democratic in constitution. He was in favour of an aristocracy within democracy. Dayanand refers to the election of the President and councillors by the people which shows that he advocates the cause of democracy. However, those who are to be elected must be men of light and learning.

Law

The view of Dayanand is that law alone is the real king. The law alone is the true governor that maintains order among the people. Where the law rules supreme, there the people never go astray. If law is administered by a just and learned man, the people live in happiness. The law rightly administered by the king greatly promotes the practice of virtue, acquisition of wealth and secures the attainment of the heart-felt desires of the people. Likewise, the same Law destroys the king who is sensual, indolent, crafty, malevolent, mean and low-minded.

Dayanand does not admit the necessity of placing any one above the law. He does not provide even a separate set of judicial courts for the trial of king and other high officers. His view is that the punishment inflicted on the king should be a thousand times heavier than that of an ordinary person. The penalty imposed on a King's minister should be eight hundred times, the official lower than him seven hundred and one still lower six hundred and so on. Even the lowest official such as a constable should be punished not less than eight times as heavily as an ordinary man should be The reason given for this view is that if the Government servants are not punished more severely than the ordinary people, they would tyrannise over them.

Administration of Justice

Dayanand stood for impartial judicial administration. According to him, he who violates the laws of justice, is considered as the lowest of the low by the wise. The judges are to be appointed by the executive authority. They must be highly learned men. Dayanand was not in favour of the complete separation of the executive from the judiciary.

According to him, the king is given the power of detecting cases of bribery and miscarriage of justice throughout the kingdom. He is asked to confiscate all the possessions of a person who is found guilty of giving

an unjust decision. That person is also to be banished to a place from where he can never return. Dayanand had no soft corner for the corrupt judges, ambassadors and other public administrators. The reason given by him was that if the corrupt officials go unpunished, others would feel encouraged to commit similar wicked crimes.

According to Dayanand, the king and the judges should decide cases justly according to the laws of the land and the teachings of the Dharamsastras. Fresh legislation should be such which promotes the welfare of the rulers and the ruled. The judges should observe the eternal law of justice and decide all cases of disputes among men justly and without partiality. It is the duty of the judge to seek the truth. He who remains quiet before injustice, is the greatest sinner. Where justice is destroyed by injustice and truth by untruth under the very nose of the judges who simply look on, all those who preside over that court are as if dead, not one of them is alive. Justice being destroyed shall destroy the destroyer. Justice being protected shall protect the protector. Hence no man should violate the laws of justice. He who violates the laws of justice is considered as the lowest of the low by the wise. In this world, justice is the true friend that accompanies the man even after death.

Dayanand points out that only those persons are eligible to appear as witnesses who are men of character, straightforward, who know their duty properly and are truthful and free from covetousness. A witness who says something in a court of law which is different from what he had seen or heard, should have his tongue cut off so that he may live in misery and pain for the rest of his life. It is the duty of the Presiding Officer to tell every witness that he must speak the truth and also the consequences of telling a lie.

It is the duty of the court to give just punishment. The infliction of unjust punishment destroys the reputation and honour of the judge in this world as well as the glory to come. The guilty should always be punished and the innocent should never be punished. A king who inflicts punishment on those who do not deserve it and inflicts no punishment on those who deserve it, brings infamy on himself in this life and also sinks to great depths of misery in the next world. Neither through friendship nor even at the offer of wealth should a king let a criminal go unpunished. A person who is convicted of the murder of another, should be ordered to be put to death. Most excellent is the king in whose realm there will be neither a thief nor an adulterer nor a slanderer, nor a perpetrator of atrocious violence such as dacoit nor a transgressor of the law.

Both the king and the queen should be punished if they commit crimes and no leniency should be shown to them. As a matter of fact, they should be punished ever more severely than the other people. If the king is not punished, the other people also will not obey the law.

Dayanand gives his justification for the infliction of severe punishments on the guilty. The infliction of a heavy punishment on one man prevents others from committing similar crimes and tends to keep them steadfast in righteousness. The so-called light punishment, by its failure to check crime, is really a thousand times heavier than the first, as it is multiplied a thousand times by the proportional increase in crime. The seemingly light punishment in the long run turns to be heavier one.

On Foreign Rule

The view of Dayanand was that in the distant past, the Aryas were the paramount power throughout the world but in the nineteenth century, "Let alone governing other countries, the Aryas through indolence, negligence and mutual discord and ill-luck do not possess a free, independent, uninterrupted and fearless rule even over their own country. Whatsoever rule is left to them, is being crushed under the heel of the foreigner. There are only a few independent states left. When a country falls upon evil days, the natives have to bear untold misery and suffering. **Say what you will, the indigenous native rule is by far the best.** A foreign Government, perfectly free from religious prejudices, impartial towards all—the natives and foreigners—kind, beneficent and just to the natives like their parents though it may be, can never render the people perfectly happy. It is extremely difficult to do away with differences in language, religion, education, customs and manners, but without doing that the people can never fully effect mutual good and accomplish their object." In order to forge national unity in India, Dayanand tried to make Hindi the national language, the Vedas the basis of Indian religion and the Gurukul training the ideal educational system for the country.

Dayanand was sure that the British rule in India would not be permanent. He referred to the general causes leading to political changes in these words: "In this world, over which a just God presides, the rule of the proud, the unjust and the ignorant cannot last very long. It is also a law of nature that the accumulation of wealth in a community out of all proportion to its needs and requirements brings in its train indolence, jealousy, mutual hatred, lustfulness, luxury and neglect of duty, which put an end to all sound learning and education, whose place is usurped by evil customs, manners and practices like the use of meat and wine, child marriage and licentiousness. Besides, when people acquire perfection in the military science and the art of war, and the army becomes so formidable that no one in the whole world can stand it on a field of battle, pride and party-spirit increase among them who then become unjust. Thereaftar they lose all power either through mutual dissensions, or a strong man from among families of little importance rises to distinction and is powerful enough to subjugate them.

It is true that Dayananad did not directly name the British Government and the loss of power by it, but indirectly hinted at the same. It is noteworthy that long before the rise of the Indian National Congress, Dayanand included in the curriculum compulsory military training and the use of firearms. Valentine Chirol was of the view that Dayanand was a deep-dyed politician who aimed at the subversion of British rule in India. The whole trend of his teachings was less to reform Hinduism than to raise it into active resistance to an alien domination.

Dayanand took pride in the glorious past of India. He called Aryavarta the Golden land. To quote him. "This country is such as no other country in the world can be compared with it. It is called the golden land as it produces gold and precious stones." The thinking of Dayanand was affected by the poverty of India. He believed that the foreign rule in India was the main cause of her poverty. For the first time in the history of India, Dayanand used the term Swarajya in 1875. He believed that after

the attainment of Swarajya, India would become rich once again. Dayanand told the people that formerly they used to go abroad and were never declared impure on that account. He put emphasis on the necessity of going abroad so that the Indians may become fearless and bold. That could also increase India's trade with foreign countries and help them to become prosperous. The view of Dayanand was that a country always remains poor and miserable if "the people of the country trade only among themselves, whilst the foreigners control their trade and rule over them." In many of his lectures, Dayanand advocated foreign travel for his countrymen.

Swadeshi

Dayanand was perhaps the first protagonist of the cause of Swadeshi. He found that the people of India were taking pride in using articles of foreign manufacture and wearing European dress and copying Western style of life. He praised the spirit of patriotism of the Britishers who even after living in India for long periods, did not give up their own type of dress and continued to love things of their own country. To quote Dayanand, "They (Europeans) devote their body, their soul and wealth to the well-being and progress of their nation; they allow into their offices and courts only European shoes and not Indian shoes. This one point is sufficient to show how patriotic they are; they respect the shoes of their country more than they respect the men of other countries. These Europeans are living in this country for a little more than a hundred years, yet they wear thick clothes as they do in their own country. They have not forsaken the ways of their country. Many of you have copied their ways. This shows that they are wise and you are foolish. They always help the trade of their country. These qualifications and deeds have contributed to their advancement." Dayanand was a staunch supporter of Swadeshi and fully realised the economic implications of the use of foreign goods by Indians. He wanted to strengthen the economy of the country by advocating the cause of Swadeshi goods. By his example, by his writings and by his lectures, he encouraged and preached the use of only those articles which were made in India.

According to Dayanand, the term Swadeshi had a wider significance. It not only implied the use of the things made in India but also the use of one Indian language. Dayanand had been speaking and writing in Sanskrit. He realised the importance of a national language for the sake of the unity of the country. At a time when the Indians were accepting the claim of English as a superior language, being the language of the rulers, Dayanand declared that Hindi in Devanagri script be accepted by all as the national language as it was spoken and understood by the majority of Indians. Hindi alone was fit to be the national language of India. Although he was a Gujarati and did not know much Hindi, he was patriotic enough to prefer Hindi to Gujarati. He himself started speaking and writing in Hindi. He worked hard to promote the use of Hindi.

Social Reformer

Dayanand was a social reformer. He denounced the superstitions, harmful and misleading beliefs, customs and practices in Hindu society.

He thundered against the demoralising effects of child marriage, the extravagance of marriage expenses, the insanity of feasts after the death of a person, the Purdah system, denial of female education, idolatry, superstition, caste system, untouchability and all the cramping customs, laws, usages and beliefs which had made Hindu life one of life-long repression, a galling yoke, a slavery of the most unmanly, soul-oppressing type.

He carried on a life-long crusade against the caste system. According to him, the class to which one belongs cannot be determined on birth. He or she has got to be watched as to the manifestation of his or her qualities. To quote him, "Classes of all persons should be determined according to their qualifications, accomplishments and character in the twenty-fifth or the sixteenth year, according as they are males or females."

Dayanand was opposed to the arranging of marriages by parents and guardians. His view was that when people choose their partners of life themeslves, there is less likelihood of mutual disagreement and the children born of such a union are also of a superior order. There is nothing but trouble in store for those whose marriage is not of their own choice. However, Dayanand was not in favour of free and unrestricted mixing of young men and women. The teachers of the boys and girls were to help their wards in the selection of their partners by pointing out to them the temperament, character and accomplishments of their wards.

The view of Dayanand was that the castes were not created by God and salvation did not depend upon the caste system. Castes were merely social orders which were established for the better discharge of different functions.

Education

Dayanand was a progressive thinker. His view was that education should not be the privilege of the selected few and must be given to all. "There should be a law of the state and also the custom of society that no one could keep his son or daughter at home beyond age of five or eight years. They must send them to a residential school. And if they do not, they should be punished." While in a residential school, "all should get the same kind of clothes, food and beddings, whether they be princes or of poor families. They should all live a life of austerity." According to Dayanand, every one was to get equal opportunity to receive education and development of his or her inner qualities. Education was to be compulsory and life in schools was to be the same for everybody irrespective of the status of his or her parents. The responsibility to impart education under equal and similar conditions to everyone was to be that of the state. "The state is to see and arrange that girls and boys both have to receive education from such age. Nobody should be allowed under state regulations to keep his daughter or son at home after the age of eight years. They must be sent to the residential schools and should not be allowed to marry before completion of their education." The period from five or eight years to 25 years in case of boys and upto 16 in case of girls was compulsorily to be spent in residential schools where they were not permitted to come into contact with their parents. They were to regard their teachers as their parents whose duty was to develop the inner qualities of

their wards. The parents were not supposed to bear the expenses of their children. That was the responsibility of the state and society. The entire education was to be free and compulsory. The teachers of the residential schools were required to decide the real worth of each of their wards and to which class (intellectuals, administrators and military men, businessmen and industrialists and manual labourers) of society they were to belong.

It is rightly pointed out that many ideas of Dayanand have been incorporated in the Indian Constitution. Untouchability has been abolished. The disabilities from which women suffered in the past have been removed by law. Child marriage has been forbidden. Universal compulsory education upto the age of fourteen has been recognised as obligatory on the part of the state. Hindi has been accepted as the national language of India. Dayanand did not accept the right to property to be absolute and the same is now the position of the right to property under the Indian Constitution.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Arbindo Ghosh : *Dayanand.*
Bahadur Mal : *Dayanand, A Study in Hinduism*, 1962.
Bahadur Mal : *Swami Dayanand and his Teachings*, 1956.
Dayanand, Swami : *The Satyarthprakash*, (English translation by Pandit Ganga Prasad).
Dayanand, Swami : *Introduction to the Commentary on the Rigveda and the other Vedas* (English translation by Dr. Permanand).
Dayanand, Swami : *Samskarvidhi* (A Manual of Vedic Rituals).
Diwan Chand, Lala : *The Arya Samaj.*
Ganga Prasad : *Swami Dayanand and his Philosophy.*
Ganga Prasad : *Landmarks of Swami Dayanand's Teachings*, Allahabad, 1947.
Ganga Prasad : *Philosophy of Dayanand*, Allahabad, 1955.
Hans Raj, Mahatma : *The Great Seer.*
Jordens, J.T.F. : *Dayanand Saraswati, His Life and Ideas*, Delhi, 1978.
Malhotra, Shanta : *Political Thought of Swami Dayanand*, New Delhi, 1980.
Munshi Ram, Mahatma : *Lectures on the Arya Samaj.*
Pandey, Dhanpati : *The Arya Samaj and Indian Nationalism*, New Delhi, 1972.
Sarda, H.B. (Ed.) : *Dayanand Commemoration Volume*, Ajmer, 1933.
Sarda, H.B. : *Swami Dayanand Saraswati.*
Satya Prakash : *A Critical Study of the Philosophy of Dayanand*, Ajmer, 1938.
Sharma, B.M. : *Swami Dayanand , His Life and Teachings*, Lucknow, 1933.

CHAPTER IV

Swami Vivekananda (1863-1902)

In the words of Jawaharlal Nehru, "Rooted in the past and full of pride in India's heritage, Vivekananda was yet modern in his approach to India's problems and was a kind of bridge between the past of India and her present. He wanted to combine Western progress with India's spiritual background." Due to his heroic mood and sometimes even domineering character, Romain Rolland called Vivekananda "The Hindu Napoleon". Vivekananda was not merely an idealist dreamer. He insisted on character-building, discipline and strength of mind. To him, love for the Motherland was the first commandment and religion came next. His message to the youth of India was: "Be strong and be fearless." Again, "Above all, be strong, be manly. I have respect even for one who is wicked so long as he is manly and strong, for his strength will make him some day give up his wickedness or even give up all work for selfish ends and will then eventually bring him into the truth". If Rammohan Roy can be called the intellectual progenitor of the Liberals, Vivekananda was the spiritual progenitor of the Radicals. Several concepts later on developed by the radical leaders are found in the writings of Vivekananda. The view of D. Reincourt is that Rabindranath Tagore, Aurobindo Ghose, and Mahatma Gandhi all acknowledged their debt to Rama Krishna and Vivekananda.

Vivekananda was born on 12 January 1863 and he died on 4 July 1902. His original name was Narendranath Datta. He studied thoroughly the philosophy of Descartes, Kant, Hegel, Schopenhauer, John Stuart Mill, Hume and Herbert Spencer. He is said to have gone through all the eleven volumes of Encyclopaedia Britannica. He also studied the Western sciences. The analytical approach of the Western thinkers appealed to him and influenced him.

It was his restless quest for pure reason that led him to question the existence of God. The satisfactory reply was given by Sri Ramakrishna and Narendranath became his disciple. After the death of Sri Ramakrishna in 1886, the Ramakrishna Order was started and Vivekananda was acknowledged as its head. In 1893, Vivekananda went to Chicago to attend the Parliament of Religions. The speech given by Vivekananda at the gathering of the intellectuals impressed them all. Vivekananda became a world figure and thereby raised the prestige of India and Hinduism very high. The New York Herald wrote that Vivekananda was "undoubtedly the greatest figure in the Parliament of Religions. After hearing him, we feel how foolish it is to send missionaries to this learned nation". Vivekananda came back to India after his foreign tour of about four years and he was received with tremendous ovations everywhere he went from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas.

Faith in Hinduism

Although Vivekananda had unflinching faith in Hindu religion, he did not take it in a narrow spirit. He denounced untouchability. He was against the "cult of the kitchen and the cooking pot". He wanted every-one to perform his duties and work for the good of others. He was an advocate of the Varna system of the Hindus but he would like to remove the evil practices that had crept into the system. He denounced the priestly class in very strong terms because that was responsible for the social tyranny and degradation of the masses. He criticised the old orthodox view that the Brahmans were entitled to certain privileges. He stood for the equality of all classes. According to him, all men were equal and equally entitled to spiritual wisdom. He insisted on raising the status of women and the masses. He attributed the degeneration of India to their suppression. The masses must be elevated and caste must be restored to its original foundation which was based on equality and not birth.

Vivekananda was very much impressed by the poverty of India and he shed tears at the poverty of common people and their oppression by the rich.

The view of Vivekananda was that Hindu spiritualism had to be given a new purpose. It had to shed its passivity and fatalism. Renunciation is a means to an end and not an end in itself. Ritual is a vehicle to reach God. Superstition has its roots in fear which has no place in one's relationship with God and man. Vivekananda saw the necessity of lifting his fellowmen from the morass of gross superstitions and mindless rituals. His view was that dire poverty was the single factor that had stripped his countrymen of every shred of human dignity and terrorised them into unquestioned submission. His view was that religion was not for empty bellies. To quote him, "It is mockery to offer religion to a starving man".

The view of Vivekananda was that the workshop, the school, the farmyard and the field were as much the meeting points with God as the temple, the mosque and the church. The service of man is the worship of God. To labour honestly is to pray. To conquer is to renounce.

His Nationalism and Patriotism

Vivekananda was a great nationalist and a patriot. He loved his country from the core of his heart and was most anxious to make it free and progressive. He called for leaders who stood firm in life. To quote him, "What India wants is a new electric fire to stir up fresh vigour in the national veins. What my country wants is muscles of iron and nerves of steel—gigantic wills that nothing can resist, men strong and sincere to the backbone. A hundred such men and the world becomes revolutionized."

Vivekananda was a great patriot and he wanted his country to be free. However, he did not openly advocate the cause of India's freedom. That was partly due to the fact that he was a Sanyasi (monk) and he did not want to get himself involved in political and legal controversies. Another reason was that Vivekananda wanted to devote his whole energy to the cause of the emancipation of the poor and the down-trodden and hence he did not join politics where he would have been certainly put in prison by the British Government.

Instead of talking about political freedom, he talked about strength which alone could bring political freedom. He put the greatest emphasis on strength. According to him, strength is the medicine for the world's disease. Strength is the medicine which the poor must have when tyrannised over by the rich. Strength is religion and its very essence. Strength is greater than religion and nothing is greater than strength.

Vivekananda advocated the moral foundations of national solidarity. He declared that he was an Indian and every Indian was his brother.

Vivekananda criticised the policy followed by the Indian National Congress at that time. His view was that that policy could not improve the lot of the people. He wanted the Congress to work for the good of the masses. He was very much depressed by their miserable condition.

It is true that Vivekananda built his nationalism on religion but it cannot be said that he was a communalist. By religion he meant the eternal principles of moral and spiritual advancement. He believed in universal toleration and not in social and religious imposition.

Religious Nationalism

The view of M. N. Roy is that the nationalism of Vivekananda was in the nature of spiritual imperialism. However, it is pointed out that the very idea of spiritual imperialism is a contradiction in terms. What Vivekananda pleaded for was not imperialism but nationalism based on spiritualism and hence Vivekananda can be described as the father of religious and spiritual nationalism in India. To quote Vivekananda, "Race, religion, Government, all these together make the nation. The one common ground that we have is our sacred tradition, our religion. This is the only common ground and upon that we shall have to build. In Europe, political ideas form the national unity. The unity in religion, therefore, is absolutely necessary as the first condition of the future of India". Vivekananda explained that by one religion he did not mean denominational religion like Christianity or Buddhism. He maintained that in Hindu religion there were certain common grounds and Hindu religion also admitted variation. What he meant by religion was that certain fundamentals which were common to all religions, should be accepted throughout India. He emphasized the importance of one religion in bringing about unity in these words, "We see how in Asia and specially in India, race difficulties, linguistic difficulties, national difficulties, social difficulties, all melt away before this unifying power of religion. In the case of India, it is the only basic means of work; work in any other line, without first strengthening this, would be disastrous. Therefore that first plank in the making of a future India, the first step that is to be hewn out of that rock of ages, is this unification of all religions."

Vivekananda has righly been called the patriot-monk of India. He asked the youngmen of the country to be fearless and work for the glory of their country He asked them as to why it was that forty millions of Englishmen were able to rule three hundred millions of Indians. He himself pointed out that the secret was the accumulation of will-power, coordination and bringing them all into focus. He also pointed out that the Indians lacked

organisation and obedience to leadership. Organisation was the key to the understanding of the strength of modern societies and the people of India must acquire the same. He called upon the Indians to give up their slavish mentality. To quote him, "For the next fifty years, this alone shall be our keynote, our great Mother India. Let all other vain Gods disappear for that time from our minds. This is the only God that is awake, our own race, everywhere His hands. Everywhere His feet, everywhere His ears. He covers everything. All other Gods are sleeping. When we have worshipped this, we shall be able to worship all the Gods." Vivekananda put great emphasis on national education as he considered the existing educational system to be a negative one. To quote him, "The ideal, therefore, is that we must have the whole education of our country, spiritual and secular, in our own hands, and it must be on national lines, through national methods, as far as practicable."

Religion

Vivekananda was a Vedantist. He was a believer in Advaita or Monism. He had a firm faith in the unity of Godhood and the deeper unity of all religions. Every religion had its own rituals, mythology and fundamental principles. The real substance of all reigions lies in their principles and it is there, that unity of all religions can be seen. To quote Vivekananda, "As the different streams having their sources in different places all mingle their water in the sea, so, O Lord! the different paths which men take through different tendencies, various though they appear, crooked or straight, all lead to Thee".

The view of Vivekananda was that sectarianism, bigotry and fanaticism had no place in religion as all people were trying to reach the same goal. In order to gain infinite universal individuality, little prison individuality must go. To quote him, "Then alone can death cease when I am one with life, then alone can misery cease when I am one with happiness itself; then alone can errors cease when I am one with knowledge itself, and this is the necessary scientific conclusion." Again, "Even science is nothing but the confining of unity. Science has proved that physical individuality is a delusion, that my body is one little continuously changing body in an unbroken ocean of matter and Advaita is the necessary conclusion with my other counterpart, soul".

Vivekananda maintained that there is an abstract humanity which is common to all. There is a universal religion which runs through all the religions of the world in the form of God. It must and does exist through eternity.

Nation

Vivekananda believed in the individuality of nation. To quote him, "In each nation, as in music, there is a main note, a central theme upon which all others turn". His view was that the spiritual foundations of India's culture had a mission for the West and the rest of the world.

His Concept of Freedom

Vivekananda's concept of freedom was an important contribution to political theory. His concept of freedom was a comprehensive one. He stood

not only for spiritual freedom but also for material, social and political freedom. To quote him, "To advance towards freedom, physical, mental and spiritual and help others to do so, is the supreme prize of man. Those social rules which stand in the way of the unfoldment of this freedom are injurious and steps should be taken to destroy them speedily. Those institutions should be encouraged by which men advance in the path of freedom". Again, "It is our natural right to be allowed to use our own body, intelligence or wealth according to our will, without doing any harm to others and all the members of society ought to have the same opportunity for obtaining wealth, education or knowledge".

Vivekananda pleaded strongly for a democratic set-up and social justice. According to him, integral freedom—physical freedom, mental freedom and spiritual freedom—had been the watch-words of the Upanishads. Vivekananda hoped that the freedoom which dawned in America on 4 July 1776 would become universal in the world.

According to Vivekananda, every man must have liberty to think and speak. He must have every liberty in food, dress and marriage and every other thing so long he does not injure others. In one of his famous poems entitled "Song of the Sanyasi", Vivekananda praised liberty and freedom.

Equality

The view of Vivekananda was that no man and no nation can gain tal freedom without mental equality. To quote him. "This is the bane of physical freedom without physical equality. Likewise, there can be no menhuman nature, the curse upon mankind, the root of all miseries; this inequality. This is the source of all bondage—physical, mental and spiritual." The view of Vivekananda was that equality was necessary not only in the spiritual field but also in the material field. It was as important for the householder as it was for the Sanyasi.

Hindu Secularism

It is true that the whole of the attention of Vivekananda was devoted to religion and spirituality, but he is also described as the father of Hindu secularism. This is due to the fact that he talked very emphatically of the concept of religious toleration in Hindu religion. In the direction of secularism, Vivekananda went beyond the plea for religious toleration. He raised the status of secular matters and did not downgrade them. He is said to have observed that what India needed was not more of spirituality as she needed bread. The material demands of the poor were as important as their spiritual demands. Vivekananda stood for a complete separation between religion and social laws. To quote him, "Social laws were created by economic conditions under the sanction of religion. The terrible mistake of religion was to interfere in social matters. What we want is that religion should not be a social reformer but we insist at the same time that society has no right to become a religious law-giver. Hands off! Keep yourself to your own bounds and everything would come right".

Vivekananda is called a secularist because he stood for a complete sepa-

ration between religion and social laws. According to Vivekananda, what we want is not so much spirituality as the bringing down of Advaita into the material world. First bread and then religion. We stuff them with too much religion when the poor fellows have been starving.

As a Socialist

Vivekananda defined soialism in these words: "The doctrine which demands the sacrifice of individual freedom to the social supremacy is called socialism, while that which advocates the cause of the individual is called individualism". He applied this definition to Indian conditions in these words, "Born in the caste, the whole life must be lived according to caste regulations. In other words, the Western man is born individualistic, while the Hindu is socialistic, entirely socialistic".

The view of Vivekananda was that the caste system did not provide an ideal blue-print for a socialist society. He once observed, "All caste, either on the principle of birth or marriage, is bondage". As a traditionalist, he could not afford to simply denounce the caste system. He had to account for it also. The way out of the difficulty was the raising of all castes to the level of the highest one and that was what Vivekananda advocated in his plea for the Brahmanization of Indian culture.

In his brand of socialism, the poor, the miserable and the weak were his Gods and they ought to be worshipped first. Doing that was holier than digging a well on the banks of the Ganges. To quote him, "So long as a dog remains hungry in our country, to feed the dog is Dharma, all else is Adharma".

Vivekananda is said to have declared, "I am a socialist not because I think it is a perfect system, but because half a loaf is better than no bread." He was a socialist in the sense that he did not believe in social inequality. He was opposed to the exploitation of the poor and advocated their upliftment. He did not believe that the Brahmanas as such were entitled to certain privileges. He would like to put an end to all the inequalities in Indian society. He showed his resentment against the upper classes in India and called them as "Mummies ten thousand years old" and "real walking corpses".

Vivekananda stood for an equal chance for all the people. In his view, the poor and the weak should be given more chances than are given to the rich and the strong. To quote him, "Brahman is not so much in need of education as a Chandala. If the son of a Brahman needs one teacher, that of a Chandala needs ten. For, greter help must be given to him whom nature has not endowed with an acute intellect from birth. It is a mad man who carries coal to Newcastle. The poor, the down-trodden, the ignorant, let these be your God".

Theory of Political Cycles or Cycle of Caste

The view of Vivekananda was that according to the prevalence in greater or lesser degree all the three qualities Sattva (the serene), Rajas (the active) and Tamas (the ignorant) in man, the four castes, Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra, are present everywhere at all times in all civilised

states. However, their number and power vary at different times in regard to different countries. To quote him. "In some countries, the numerical strength or influence of one of those castes may preponderate over another; at some period, one of the classes may be more powerful than the rest. But from a careful study of the history of the world, it appears that, in conformity to the law of nature, the four castes, the Brahmana, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Sudra do, in every society, one after another in succession, govern the world. This is true of the Chinese, the Sumerians, the Babylonians, the Egyptians, the Chaldeans, the Aryans, the Iranians, the Jews and the Arabs."

Among the nations mentionel above, the supreme power of guiding society is, in the first period of their history, in the hands of the Brahmana or the priest. In the second period, the ruling power is the Kshatriya, i.e., absolute monarchy or oligarchical government by a chosen body of men. Among the modern Western nations, with England at their head. this power of controlling society has been for the first time in the hands of the Vaishyas or mercantile communities made rich through the carrying on of commerce.

Vivekananda explains the rise and fall of the above-mentioned classes. According to him, the foundation of the priestly power rests on intellectual strength and not on physical strength of arms. The priests know the Gods and communicate with them. With abundant leisure given to them, they develop spiritual knowledge and capacity. The first off-shoot of universal welfare and good is nursed by his spiritual power, by his devotion to learning and wisdom and by his renunciation. It is not surprising that "a word from the priest who has neither wealth nor men behind him but whose sole strength is his spiritual power, can quench the despotic royal will, as water the fire". Two reasons led to the decline of the priestly power. The repository of priestly power and the centre of its influence are wholly mental and consists in the ability of the priests to "communicate" with the gods through uttering certain words, the repetition of certain syllables and other similar processes and applications of the mind which are kept secret. Faith wavers. The second reason is that keeping their systems of thought among themselves, their human nature becomes a victim of extreme selfishness and hypocrisy as is inevitable under such conditions of secrecy. If knowledge is concealed, any wise interpretation of it is likely to be hidden from the world. What is apparent is thought to have originated from some supernatural force. Far from making fresh efforts to look for originality and gain knowledge of new sciences, it is considered useless and futile to attempt even to improve the remnants of the old by cleansing them of their corruptions. "Thus lost to former wisdom, the former indomitable spirit of self-reliance, the priest now, glorifying himself in the name of his forefathers, vainly struggles to preserve untarnished for himself the same glory, the same privilege, the same veneration and the same supremacy as was enjoyed by his great forefathers. Consequently his violent collision with the other castes." The priest had forgotten an elementary truth about social progress, namely, "for the welfare of society, it is absolutely necessary at certain time to have all knowledge and power concentrated in certain families or castes to the exclusion of others, but that concentrated power is focussed for the time

being, only to be scattered broadcast over the whole of society in future. If this diffsion is withheld, the destruction of that society is, without doubt, near at hand."

According to Vivekananda, an "identical mistake is committed during the period of Kshatriya supremacy. As the priest is busy about centralising all knowledge and learning at a common centre, to wit, himself, so the king is ever up and doing in collecting all the earthly powers and focussing them in a central point, i.e., his own self." The king, the centre of the forces of the aggregate of his subjects (i.e., who smybolises in himself the strength of the whole people), soon forgets that those forces are only stored with him so that he may increase and give them back a thousandfold in their potency with the result that they may spread over the whole community for its good. The oppression steps into the place of protection. A fierce contest between the king and his subjects starts and "the throne and the royal paraphernalia become like past curiosities preserved in the museum galleries".

As a result of this contest, the Vaishyas come into power. Just as learning made the Brahmana powerful and the power of the sword made the Kshatriya powerful, the power of the Vaishya depends upon his wealth. As during the supremacy of the Brahmana and the Kshatriya there is a centralisation of learning and advancement of civilisation, so the result of the supremacy of the Vaishya is the accumulation of wealth. Through the trade directed by the Vaishyas, the wisdom, civilisation and arts that accumulated in the heart of the social body during the Brahmana and Kshatriya supremacy, are being diffused in all directions by the arteries of commerce.

The view of Vivekananda is that "a time will come when there will be the rising of the Sudra class.... when the Sudras of every country, with their inborn Sudra nature and habits—not becoming in essence Vaishya or Kshatriya, but remaining as Sudras, will gain absolute supremacy in every country." Socialism, Anarchism, Nihilism and other similar sects are in the vanguard of the social revolution that is to follow.

According to Vivekananda, the Sudra class is known for its physical labour but it is only because of this physical labour that the Brahmin has his influence, the Kshatriya has his power and the Vaishya has his fortune. In the India of his age, the foreign professors were the Brahmanas, the ruling Englishmen were the Kshatriyas and they were the Vaishyas also. Therefore all Indians were now the Sudras. "The whole population has virtually come down to the level of Sudras. The Sudras are a little awake. But they do not have education and they do not have unity and that is why they form the subject race."

Vivekananda pointed out that in ancient India the Sudra class was kept down because they had no opportunities for education or accumulation of wealth. In some cases when a man of extraordinary genius was born in the Sudra class, he was lifted out in the caste system and his wealth and wisdom were used not for the Sudra class but for the higher castes. The things are different in modern times as the caste system had become hereditary. No one who is born in the Sudra class is lifted upward and therefore what-

ever contributions great individuals in that caste make, those are for the benefit of their caste alone.

According to Vivekananda, the source of all power is always the masses of India who are a sleeping Leviathan. Wwhenever those in power were alienated from the subject masses, they were overthrown. The power of the Brahmanas was overthrown when they were alienated from the masses. The Kshatriyas came to power as they took their stand on the strength of the masses. They also lost their power when they were alienated from the masses. The Vaishyas came to power because they took their stand on the strength of the masses. Vivekananda declared that the Vaishyas would also lose their power because they were being alienated from the subject masses. Vivekananda believed in the concept of popular sovereignty. His view was that the future of India was tied up with the future of the power of the Sudras of the country As everybody belonged to that caste, that meant a state of castelessness and the masses as a whole will be supreme in future as against one group of people or the other.

Revivalist or Reformer

Vivekananda was both a revivalist and a reformer. He was a revivalist in so far as he tried to revive Indian traditions and not to imitate the West. He was a reformer in as much as he sought to incorporate the modern spirit of social and economic equality in Indian society. He tried to assimilate the modern rationalistic spirit of the West without discarding Indian spirituality. Although he defended image worship, yet he described it as the lowest form of worship. Although he spoke in favour of social reform, he raised his voice of protest against any attack on Indian institutions merely because the Westerners disapproved of the same.

Vivekananda was against the indiscriminate imitation of the Western ways of life. According to him, "We must grow according to our nature. Vain is to attempt the lines of action that foreign societies have engrafted upon us: it is impossible. Glory unto God, that it is impossible, that we cannot be twisted and tortured into the shape of other nations. I do not condemn the institutions of other races; they are good for them, but not for us. With other sciences, other institutions and oher traditions behind them, they have got their present system. We, with our traditions, with thousands of years of Karma behind us, naturally can only follow our own bent, run in our own grooves and that we shall have to do. We cannot become Westearns; therefore, imitating the Western is useless. Suppose you can imitate the Westerns, that moment you will die, you will have no more life in you. A stream is taking its rise, away beyond where time began flowing through millions of ages of human history; do you mean to get hold of that stream, and push it back to its source, to a Himalayan glacier? Even if that were practicable, it would not be possible for you to be Europeanized. If you find it is impossible for the European to throw off the few centuries of old culture which there is in the West, do you think it is possible for you to throw off the culture of shining scores of centuries? It cannot be. To Europeanize India is, therefore, an impossible and foolish task."

Vivekananda wanted to stimulate the pride of Indians in their own customs, civilisation and way of life. He travelled and lectured in every nook and corner of India and spoke against mere imitation and indiscriminate

Westernization. He deplored the growing denationalisation of the Indians under the impact of the Western culture.

Vivekananda stood for radical reforms in Hindu society but he did not approve of the approach and the language used by the social reformers in India. His view was that the social reformers had confined their activities to the upper castes and classes and had not touched the masses at all. They had put greater emphasis on widow remarriage which affected primarily the upper classes than on the removal of untouchability which concerned the masses. To quote him, "Most of the reforms that have been agitated during the last century have been ornamental. Every one of these reforms only touches the first two castes (the Brahmanas and Kshatriyas). Every effort has been spent in cleaning (the reformers') own houses, making themselves nice and in looking pretty before foreigners. That is no reformation."

Vivekananda called upon the reformers to go to the masses in these words: "Go down to the basis of the thing, to the very roots. That is what I call radical reformation. Put the fire there and let it burn upwards and make an Indian nation."

Vivekananda was a Karmayogi and he drowned himself in ceaseless activity for the uplift of India. In the United States, he was called the "cyclonic Hindu". His death at the age of 39 was a great loss to the world in general and India in particular.

It is true that Vivekananda was a revivalist and a reformer but he also impressed upon his countrymen the urgent need of learning Western sciences and coming into intimate contact with foreigners. His view was that one important cause of the degeneration of the Hindus was that believing that they could do without the world, they refused to travel to foreign countries. Vivekananda called upon the Hindus not to observe those social laws which prohibited them from crossing the seas or going to foreign lands. He himself set the example by visiting the foreign countries many times.

Vivekananda called upon his countrymen to learn the methods of modern sciences and the liberal ideals of social organisation from the West. His view was that in the past though Indians enjoyed great freedom in matters of religion, yet because they enjoyed very little freedom in social matters, they developed a cramped and crystallized society. His view was that the Englishmen were the instrument sent by God to break the crystallized society of India. He considered it as one of the benefits of the British rule in India.

Vivekananda believed in the policy of moderation in the field of social reform. His view was that mere denunciation and condemnation create unnecessary social tension and antagonism. He stood for organic and slow reform.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Datta, B.N. : *Vivekananda, Partriot-Prophet*, Calcutta, 1954.
Majumdar, R.C. : *Vivekananda, A Historical Review*, Calcutta, 1965.
Nikhilanand, Swami : *Biography of Swami Vivekananda.*
Romain Rolland : *The Life of Vivekananda and the Universal Gospel*, Almora, 1947.
Vivekananda : *The Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda.*
Vivekananda : *On India and Her Problems*, Almora, 1946.

CHAPTER V

Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941)

It has rightly been said that for his creativity, his breadth of vision and his zeal in championing man's freedom from arbitrary restraints—whether social, political or religious—,Tagore deserves comparison with the great artist pholosophers of Renaissance humanism in the West. He can be described as a unique humanist because, unlike others, he was the only person who tried to raise humanity to the level of Ultimate Reality. His message of love and universal brotherhood, his ideal of universal man and one world will continue to inspire humanity in the future.

Rabindranath Tagore, the fourteenth of Maharishi Debendranath Tagore's 15 children, was born on 7 May 1861 and he died on 7 August 1941. He grew to manhood in a highly cultured family environment. The steady income from the landed estates of his family deprived him of the necessity of earning his livelihood. He gave up formal studies at the age of 13. He published his first volume of Bengalee poems at the age of 20. Year after year, his writings matured in style and grew richer in content. In 1884, he denounced in very strong language the prevalent practice in political agitation. In 1892, he advocated the introduction of Bengalee as the medium of instruction in higher educational institutions. He wrote and delivered remarkable political addresses at regular intervals voicing the wounded national sentiments and urging internal consolidation of the national movement. In 1904, he emphasized the necessity of constructive nationalism and pleaded for the reorganisation of social life on the basis of self-help with the village as the unit, the fostering of cottage industries, peasant cooperation and Hindu-Muslim amity. He was inclined towards the growing extremist trend in national politics. He supported the move to celebrate the Shivaji festival. By 1905, he was universally recognised not merely as a great poet but also as a worthy representative of Indian culture.

He took a leading part in the agitation against the Partition of Bengal in 1905. He composed a special song for the day fixed for the Partition of Bengal. That song ended with the refrain : "Let all the brothers and sisters of every Bengalee home be united in heart, O God". What was achieved by Aurobindo in the realm of thought by his fearless writings, Rabindranath Tabore conveyed the same to the masses by his songs which were full of patriotism and national consciousness. He sang the glories of ancient India and its culture and brought before the people the portraits of Shivaji and Guru Govind Singh as nation-builders.

When the National Council of Education was set up in 1906 in Bengal, Rabindranath was associated with it. He had a hand in shaping its educational policy and preparing a course of studies for it. However, his association with the anti-Partition movement did not last long. He did not approve of the adoption of methods like the boycott of schools, British goods etc.

and hence left the movement. His view was that the boycott of schools amounted to a negative sacrifice leading to non-education. The programme of boycott of British goods was also a negative one. He felt that his people needed a change of heart and a radical social programme was absolutely necessary for the attainment of real independence. It is true that political agitation was not his true line of work which lay in the realm of ideas and ideals but he was never indifferent towards the freedom struggle in the country and this fact is proved by his Pabna Address in 1908, his speech at the open session of the Indian National Congress in 1917, his renunciation of knighthood in 1919, his public condemnation at a mass rally of the police firing on the political prisoners at Hijli Jail in 1931 and his passionate protest poems against repression by the Government.

Tagore aimed at mutual understanding between the East and the West. He published in 1912 his collection entitled "Gitanjali" (Song Offerings). In 1913, he won the Nobel Prize for literature. In 1916, he was knighted although he gave up the same in 1919 as a protest against the tragedy of Jallianwala Bagh.

He started building up a University at Shanti Niketan in 1918 and the same was opened on 22 December 1921. It was given the name of Vishwa Bharati. The primary function of the new University was to present to the outside world the representative learning of India. The Vishwa Bharati represented the composite culture of India to the outside world. Tagore gave his own concept of a University in these words: "Universities should never be made into mechanical organisations for collecting and distributing knowledge. Through them, the people should offer their intellectual hospitality, their wealth of mind to others and claim their proud right in return, to receive gifts from the rest of the world."

In 1930, Tagore delivered the Hibbert Lectures in England. He became India's spiritual ambassador and he carried the mission of his country to the various parts of the world visited by him.

Humanism

Tagore was deeply influenced by the humainst tradition of Buddha. His view was that man must come out of the shell of his individual self in order to enter into the larger self of humanity. He considered man as Nara Narayan or as God-man. He was also influenced by the teachings of Kabir. He trainslated 100 poems of Kabir into English and became a sympathetic interpreter of the vision and thought of Kabir. He considered the universe as a manifestation of God. Early in his youth, he was influenced by the humanism of the West and radicalism of the British people. He accepted the definition of humanism as given by the Western scholars. His view was that man is the dominant and ultimate reality. If there is God, he must be interpreted in human terms. Tagore wanted to bridge the gulf between the East and the West and bring about a synthetic culture. He tried to create a new civilisation by a synthesis of the East and the West.

The view of Tagore was that all nations should meet at a point which is of benefit to one another. National differences were necessary for the smooth and harmonious development of humanity and they should create a desire to understand the point of view of one another.

The view of Tagore was that the best way to seek complete union with God is to seek contact through man. He found his God in man. It became his conviction that one could realise God in his completest form only through man. Through man alone God is accessible simultaneously by the path of knowledge (Jnana), devotion (Bhakti) and service (Karma). Man is the centre of interests because he manifests God in the most effective form. There is no point in looking for God in temples and offering Him flowers and burning incense there. We should seek Him among the common men. The man of piety should meet his God in toil and sweat. Mankind in general should be the object of love and service. God is specially manifest among the under-privileged classes. The labourer engaged in making roads, the farmer growing crops and in general people who live literatlly by the sweat of their brow and form the lowest strata of society represented Him in a more significant way. God should not be looked for among the well-to-do classes favoured by fortune, but among the poorer classes.

The humanism of Tagore stemmed from his living faith in God and he drew his inspiration from religion. The urge to offer service to God was both strong and universal. By linking piety with humanism, he provided a stronger inspiration than Western humansim.

His attitude towards Hinduism and Caste System

Tagore rejected the fundamental doctrines of Hinduism. He did not believe in the cycle of births and deaths. His view was that there could be no continuity of desires, passions, wealth and name in any future life. Death closes the account of this life.

He also condemned the caste system and its basic concept of inequality of men. He repudiated the idea that the material world was a snare and like a journey through the vale of pain and sorrow. He disapproved of the ascetical view of life. He found the attainment of freedom in a happy worldly life.

Tagore on Nationalism

In the words of Tagore, "A nation, in the sense of the political and economic union of a people, is that aspect which a whole population assumes when organised for a mechanical purpose." That purpose is self-preservation which "is merely the side of power, not of humane ideals." Power accumulates, organisation expands, competition and jealousy between nations and nations become deeper and bitterer. The nation replaces the harmony of the higher social life and becomes a menace and an evil. It becomes an automation led by the power of greed" capable of shameful crimes.

Tagore criticized in very strong terms the British rule in India. His view was that British rule was a soul-less machine, scornful of Indian opinion, self-assured and uncreative, colour-conscious and prejudicial, exploitative and repressive. To quote him, "It is a steam-roller formidable in its weight and power, having its uses but it does not help the soil to become fertile."

Tagore never faltered in his faith that India would rise one day, recover her spiritual strength and make her contribution towards the establishment of world unity.

Tagore was a poet of patriotism and a prophet of nationalism. He raised the stature of India in the eyes of the world. Millions of people have sung his soul-stirring patriotic songs and the National Anthem calling upon the people to nourish the unity of the country. However, he strongly condemned predatory nationalism and narrow patriotism. To quote him, "The nation with all its paraphernalia of power and prosperity.....and mock thunders of its patriotic bragging, cannot hide the fact that nation is the greatest evil for the nation, that all its precautions are against it and any new birth of its fellow in the world is always followed in its mind by the dread of a new peril. Its one wish is to trade on the feebleness of the rest of the world." Again, in small minds patriotism dissociates itself from the higher ideal of humanity. It becomes the magnification of self, on a stupendous scale, magnifying our vulgarity, cruelty and greed."

His Moral Approach to Politics

Tagore had a moral approach to politics. He condemned the barbaric manifestations of imperialistic arrogance and radical chauvinism. He was an opponent of Machiavellian statecraft in all its forms. He pleaded for the restoration of moral values in the world.

Communal Harmony

Tagore put great emphasis on communal harmony which he considered necessary for the progress of his country. His view was that "Hindus and Muslims have for centuries been nurtured by the same Motherland and yet how apart are we still". He was sure that "If we could overcome our internal dissensions, we shall be able to laugh at all attempts from outside to set us against one another." To quote him, "Hindus and Muslims constitute the two major communities of India. We must be prepared to show the sacrifice, the patience, the care and the self-restraint that are needed to unite them into a common political organisation." Tagore was unhappy that inner prejudices had kept them apart. "To the Hindu, the Mussalman is impure; for the Mussalman, the Hindu is an infidel." Those prejudices stood in the way of communal harmony.

A Rationalist

Tagore was a rationalist. He criticised the people of India for their dogmatism and superstitions. He also criticised the materialistic basis of Western civilisation. He stood for a compromise between Western sciences and Indian spiritualism. His view was that Western civilisation had turned human beings into slaves and killed their freedom and initiative to act in a natural way. He wanted the West to come forward with its science and culture to help the poor in other parts of the world. He did not like the exploitation of the various countries by Britain.

East and West

The Viswa Bharati University was started as a centre of world culture to promote goodwill among the people of different nations and religions. The ultimate aim before Tagore was the unification of mankind. The motto of the University was **Yatravisvam Bhavti Ekanidam** or where the universe becomes a single nest. However, towards the end of his life, Tagore

realised that he had failed to achieve his objective. The East and the West were not showing any sign of meeting. According to Tagore, "The reason is because the West has not sent out its humanity to meet the man in the East but only its machine." Instead of helping the weak nations, the Western Powers were trying to exploit them. Tagore called upon the people of the world to build a new society in which there was no selfishness or hatred.

Man and Machine

The view of Tagore is that the wealth that the West produces comes through the agency of a very huge and powerful machinery. The vehicle of wealth is the machine, whereas vehicle of the machine is men, thousands, even hundreds of thousands of men. They have created big cities as altars for the consecration of wealth. The power that grows stronger through the machine has enabled men to conquer the world and subdue legions of strangers into slavery. It is true that man is conscious of his own power in monstrous wealth and that is an achievement, but with the expansion of power, the field which favours the cultivation of human relations grows continually narrower. It turns into a weapon of death for man. It forges weapons to kill him and conspires to bring about his ruin. It manufactures multitudes of lies, fosters cruelty and sows the seeds of the poison tree. When sympathy has departed and when man thinks of the bulk of humanity as a useful commodity, he does not think of human beings but only the machine in them.

Society

Samaj or society is the key concept in Tagore's social philosophy which was explained by him in his Essay entitled "Swadeshi Samaj" published in 1904. He visualized society as a living organism, the basic institution necessary to ensure the material, cultural, moral and spiritual fulfilment of the individuals composing it. The earlier view of Tagore was that state and Government constituted an external force and agency which should derive strength only from the powers and functions delegated by society and should not be allowed to assume the role of directing and controlling the latter. In the later part of his life, he shifted his position slightly on the question of the role of the state. His view was that in the modern state it would not be possible to expect from the state only the negative, protective functions. He agreed with the view that the state should provide resources in a more positive way to society so that the latter could function more efficiently. By emphasizing the role of society, Tagore emphasized the cooperative and creative ideals of society.

Rights

Tagore is called a prophet of rights. To quote him, "Man does not have to beg for his rights; he must create them for himself." His view was that the right of intellectual discussion was of very great importance.

According to Tagore, rights proceed from disinterested contribution to higher good. Man does not acquire rights through occupation of larger space nor through external contact. Individuals and groups must have strength for the realisation of their rights. Weakness is a betrayal of the

human soul. Tagore advised the weak to cultivate moral force and stand against the oppressor. He wrote in 1908, "Let the Ryots be strong so that even the temptation to oppress may not exist."

Freedom

Tagore stood for the liberty of thought and action and liberty of conscience. He had a spiritual conception of freedom. The essence of freedom is the illumination of the soul by a process of self-realisation. Freedom is attained only through the recognition of the pervasive inter-dependence of all beings, expansion of consciousness, acceptance of responsibilty and the realisation of the eternal creativity of God.

Tagore and Gandhi

Both Tagore and Gandhi were towering figures who dominated the Indian scene in the first half of the twentieth century. They over-shadowed all rivals in their respective fields. Each achieved so much international fame that he thereby automatically increased the prestige of India abroad. Each in his own way spent many years in the service of his countrymen. Both Tagore and Gandhi made themselves masters of the English language and were considerably affected by their contact with Western culture.

However, they differed from each other in temperament and interest. Tagore's nature was that of a poet while Gandhiji was a statesman. Tagore's realm was artistic expression while that of Gandhiji was ethical action. Even the clothes they chose were different. While Tabore was fond of dressing in flowing silken robes, Gandhiji wore nothing but the simplest hand-spun garments.

Tagore and Gandhiji disagreed in their diagnosis of India's ills and their prescriptions for her cure. Tagore criticized Gandhiji in public on the question of the Non-cooperation movement. However, Gandhiji's fast against untouchability brought about a dramatic reconciliation between the two. Tagore was a poet and had an aesthetic approach of life. He was a seeker after beauty. He was inspired by the Hellenic concept of harmony. Gandhiji was a Puritan. He fulminated against the emptiness and conventionalism of Western civilisation. Tagore was sympathetic to the values of Western civilisation. Gandhiji glorified poverty and considered it as a passport to the Kingdom of God. Tagore also praised village huts built of mud but he was a believer in the balanced growth of all sides of life of man. He accepted some amount of property as a social necessity. Gandhiji suffered for the sake of justice and ultimately sacrificed his life. Tagore believed in temperate living and moderation. About Tagore and Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru writes, "Tagore and Gandhi have undoubtedly been the two outstanding and dominating figures of India in this first half of the twentieth century. It is instructive to compare and contrast them. No two persons could be so different from one another in their make-up of temperaments. Tagore, the aristocratic artist, turned democrat with proletarian sympathies, represented essentially the cultural tradition of India, the tradition of accepting life in the fulness thereof and going through it with song and dance. Gandhi, more a man of the people, almost the embodiment of the Indian peasant, represented the other ancient tradition of India, that of renunciation and asceticism. And yet Tagore was primarily the man of thought,

Gandhi of concentrated and ceaseless activity. Both, in their different ways, had a world outlook, and both were at the same time wholly Indian. They seemed to represent different but harmonious aspects of India and to complement one another."

Tagore and Aurobindo

Both of them were contemporaries and worked together in the agitation against the partition of Bengal. Both of them were intellecutal giants and wrote very well. Both of them were idealists and accepted the importance of moral force. Both of them reacted against the rigourism and asceticism of the Vedanta. Both of them were men of devotion and had an organic concept of society. Both of them were champions of Swadeshi. Both of them were prophets of cosmopolitanism and human unity. Both of them stood for the synthesis of the East and the West. Aurobindo was thrilled by the splendours of divine life and Yoga. Tagore glorified Nara and Narayan which are the symbols of divine humanism.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Banerjee, Hiranmay : *Rabindranath Tagora*, New Delhi, 1972.

Catlin, George, E.G. : *Rabindranath Tagore*, Bombay, 1964.

Kriplani, Krishna : *Tagore, A Life*.

Mukherjee, Kedarnath : *Political Philosophy of Rabindranath Tagore*, New Delhi, 1982.

Radhakrishnan, S. : *Philosophy of Rabihdranath Tagore*.

Roy, Kshitish : *Rabindranath Tagore, A Life Story*.

Sen, Sachin : *Political Thought of Tagore*, Calcutta.

Sinha, Sasadhar : *Social Thinking of Tagore*.

Tagore, Rabindranath : *Nationalism*, 1917.

Tagore, Rabindranath : *A Vision of India's History*, Calcutta, 1951.

Tompson, Edward, J. : *Rabindranath Tagore*, London, 1948.

Underwood, A.C. : *Contemporary Thought of India*, London, 1930.

CHAPTER VI

The Moderates and the Extremists

The early Congress leaders like Dadabhai Naoroji, Mahadeo Govind Ranade, Pherozeshah Mehta, Surendranath Banerjea, R. C. Dutt and Gokhale who dominated the affairs of the Indian National Congress from 1885 to 1905 are known as the Moderates and leaders like Bal Gangadnar Tilak, B. C. Pal, Lala Lajpat Rai and Aurobindo Ghose are called the Extremists. These two terms describe the two schools of thought that existed in India in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the early years of the twentieth century. The view of Tilak was that the terms "Moderates" and "Extremists" had a specific relation to time. The Extremists of today will be the Moderates of tomorrow just as the Moderates of today were the Extermists of yesterday. The view of Gokhale was that "there is at times a great deal of moderation among some of those who are called Extremists and on the other hand there is no small amount of what is reverse of moderation among those who are called Moderates". It is true that these terms refer to differences of time, circumstances and temperaments. However, those were not merely temperamental differences. The differences were more or less fundamental in nature. Although there were bitter personal differences between Lala Lajpat Rai and B. C. Pal, yet both of them were called Extremists on account of their common outlook, approach to politics and political thought.

The Moderates

The Moderates held the view that the movement towards self-Government in India must be a slow one and India must pass through progressive stages. The highest political development to which India could aspire was within the frame-work of the British Empire. The view of Ghokhale was that the destiny of India was linked up with England. The advance was to be gradual depending upon the progress made by the Indians in the field of politics.

One of the fundamental articles of faith of the Moderates was loyalty to the British connection. The Indians had just come under the influence of the ideals enshrined in English literature and English history. They were under the spell of the West. The British Government was considered by them as their national Government and English language as their national language. The fear of the Moderates was that with the disappearance of the British Government or the English language, India might lapse into its old grooves and hence they clung to both the British Government and the English language. English was the language of the Congress. It was the language in which they heard their political leaders. Leaders like Surendranath Banerjea were considered as popular leaders because they spoke in eloquent English.

The Moderates welcomed the rise and growth of free institutions in India during the British rule and hence they could not be disloyal to them. They would like to have more of those institutions and not less. To quote Surendranath Banerjea, "To England we look for inspiration and guidance, to England we look for sympathy in the struggle. From England must come the crowning mandate which will enfranchise our peoples. England is our political guide and moral preceptor in the exalted sphere of political duty".

There was a deep sense of gratitude among the Moderate leaders for the blessings of the British rule in India. Dadabhai Naoroji emphasized the loyalty of the Indians towards the British Government in these words in 1886: "Let us speak out like men and proclaim that we are loyal to the backbone; that we understand the benefits English rule has conferred upon us. that we throughly appreciate the education that has been given to us, the new light which has been poured upon us, turning us from darkness into light." Gokhale also put emphasis upon the achievements of British rule in India and expressed his gratitude.

The Moderates were very wise leaders. They knew that they had to take the ship of India's cause through unchartered waters to its destination and they were fully conscious of the rocks ahead. They knew that the Government of India would not tolerate any movement in India which advocated sedition and could destroy the same at the very beginning. The result was that the more patriotic the Moderates were, the more loyal they became. Their patriotism was not born out of their loyalty but their loyalty was born out of their patriotism. The new religion of loyalty-cum-patriotism was the outcome of caution which was demanded by the circumstances prevailing in the country. In every sentence in which the Moderates referred to the cause of their country, they added a qualification in which they assured the Government of their loyalty. The Moderates united the highest patriotic devotion to their country with an equally enthusiastic attachment to the British Government. The highest aspiration which Moderates cherished was to be full-fledged British citizens, not only in name but also in fact. Moderates felt that there was the hand of God in the advent of the British in India. Gokhale went to the extent of saying that the connection of India with British was a Providential dispensation. Dadabhai Naoroji strongly refuted the charge that the Congress was a nursery for sedition and rebellion against the British Government. The view of Ranade was that the British were the most gifted and free people in the world and they had a divine mission in the East. The rationale of British rule in India was its capacity and Providential purpose of fostering the political education of the people of India. Expression was given to similar sentiments by Surendranath Banerjea in 1895. He wanted India to be an integral part of the British Empire. R. C. Dutt observed thus in 1899: "Educated India has practically identified itself with British rule, seeks to perpetuate British rule, is loyal to the British rule, not through sentiment, but through the stronger motive of self-interest".

The Moderates advocated a policy of constitutional agitation by the Indian National Congress. The object of that agitation was to bring as much pressure as possible upon the authorities. It was also intended to build up the strength of the people of India. Gokhale did not approve of the methods other than constitutional agitation by the people of India. The so-

called boycott did not appeal to his imagination. About economic boycott he pointed out that the exclusion from their market of foreign goods worth a hundred crores a year was bound to be a slow affair. Even if it was successful, it would not affect our political domination which might become even harsher. Political boycott was simply impossible. It was no use destroying schools and colleges before we could build up new ones. Those institutions were very useful even for the development of national spirit. The boycott of Government services was ludicrous in the extreme. The boycott of the legislatures was futile because there were enough men in the country who take the vacant places.

The Moderates believed that constitutional agitation had not failed and could not fail. The fact was that it had not been tried. The people of India had not yet exhausted even a thousandth part of the possibilities of real constitutional agitation. English history was one long record of a policy of peaceful and persistent political pressure yielding step by step the desired results. Even in England, reforms had not been granted to the people out of a mood of generosity on the part of the rulers but those had to be wrung from reluctant hands by ceaseless bombardment of criticism in all the ways known to modern history. Dadabhai Naoroji pointed out that "Agitation is the civilised peaceful weapon of moral force and infinitely preferable to brute physical force when possible".

The Moderates based their hopes for the eventual success of constitutional agitation on a number of assumptions. They had faith in the righteousness of their cause and the operations of a sympathetic Providence. Surendranath Banerjea pointed out in 1909 that the journey might be long and wearisome but the ultimate success was certain.

The Moderates had faith in the British Government and the British people. They pinned their faith in the British people to an extent not shared by others. Constitutional agitation meant agitation in two directions. There was to be agitation to rouse the Indian people and also agitation to rouse the British people and the British Government. Their agitation was directed to convince the British that they were fit for more responsibility and had as much a right to control their domestic affairs as the other people in the British Empire had in their own countries. The Moderates maintained that as the colonies had gradually risen to the status of self-Government in a constitutional way, India also could attain the same position in a constitutional way. The Moderates believed that the British people were fair and fair-minded. To quote Surendranath Banerjea, "We have great confidence in the justice and generosity of the English people".

The Moderates were convinced that India would march towards complete freedom under the aegis of Britain. The view of Dr. Rash Behari Ghose was that "great is the destiny of England, but equally great are the responsibilities involving a sacred trust". He was confident that "the august mother of free nations, the friend of struggling nationalities and of emancipation all over the world, will rise to the height of her duty" and extend the privileges of citizenship to the people of India.

The Moderates relied upon the solemn pledges given by the British Government to the people of India from time to time. The Queen's Proclamation of 1858 was one of them. To quote Surendranath Banerjea, "The

Proclamation is the Magna Carta of our rights and liberties. The Proclamation, the whole Proclamation and nothing but the Proclamation is our watchword, our battle-cry and the ensign of victory. It is the gospel of our political redemption". The Moderates tried to bring home to the consciousness of the British statesmen the implications of their great pledges and charters and insisted that the Indians should be governed according to the principles laid down by themselves. The Moderates pointed out that the interests of India will be the interests of Britain. In the long run, what was good for India was also good for Britain and hence nothing should be done to weaken the British Empire. The Moderates did not want separation but assimilation. They wanted India to be nearer Great Britain and hence they turned their faces against all radical politics which aimed against the British Empire. The Moderates wanted progress but that progress must be compatible with and based on order.

The loyalty of the Moderates towards the British connection was not based on expediency. Their loyalty was their faith, their political religion. The British Empire was dear to their imagination. It was that one sure basis of India's present achievements and future hopes. Britain had inspired the Indians and placed before them the ideal of freedom. Surendranath Banerjea declared : "We plead for the permanence of British rule in India".

The Moderates wanted to bring about a better mutual understanding between the Government of India and the people of India. They played the role of interpreters of the popular mind to the Government and the mind of the Government to the people. This role was played by them successfully.

The Moderates aimed at the gradual establishment of the principles of democracy in the administration of the country. That was not an easy task. The Moderates had their heads in the clouds, but their feet were firmly planted on the solid ground of reality.

The Moderates did not cherish illusions as to the strength and resolution on the part of the bureacracy of India. Gokhale admitted that the citadel of monopoly of power could not be destroyed all of a sudden.

The Moderates preached the gospel of patience as nothing great was easy to achieve and one had to work patiently to achieve one's goal.

The Moderates knew that the work before them was a formidable one. They had to fight against ignorance, apathy and moral helplessness. It was a very difficult task "to energise this vast mass, to put life into it, to make it move along with us and the work is bound to be slow". The Moderates admitted that the progress made by them was slow.

The Moderates were eager to expand the scope of their programme to achieve their goal. They pointed out that if every one contributed his mite, the rich their money, the scholars and thinkers their learning and thought, the youngmen their missionary zeal and devotion, the face of India would be changed.

Although the Moderates were very modest in their programme in the beginning, they became fearless critics of individual administrative measures from the very beginning. They tried to safeguard the legal rights of the people and to ensure an impartial administration of justice. They pro-

tested against the curtailment of the powers of juries and the combination of judicial and executive functions in one person. They criticised the "strange union of the functions of the constable and magistrate, public prosecutor and criminal judge, revenue collector and appeal court in revenue cases".

The Moderates stood for the spread of general education all over the country. In 1910, Gokhale introduced a resolution for making primary education compulsory and free in British India in the Imperial Council and emphasized the fact that mass education was absolutely essential for national reconstruction. However, the resolution was opposed and rejected by the Government.

The Moderates took keen interest in the problem of public services. In a way, the whole political agitation in the country started on the issue of public services. Gokhale poined out that the examinations for the Indian Civil Service were held in England only and not in India also and the age-limit was lowered to 19 which made it extremely difficult for the Indians to compete with candidates belonging to England. The agitation had to be continued till the principle of simultaneous examinations both in India and England was accepted in 1920.

The Moderates demanded that more and more Indians should be appointed to the higher services in the country. Gokhale maintained that the success of England in India depended largely upon its successful association of Indians with the task of administration. There must be a steady movement in that direction. The Government should adopt a policy of progressive substitution of Indians for foreign agency. The Moderates pointed out that the case for the Indianisation of higher services rested partly on economic, partly on political and above all on moral grounds. There was a growing dissatisfaction in the country on the ground that they were being shut out from most of the lucrative and responsible posts in the country. The financial argument was that the foreign agency was very expensive. The Europeans demanded higher salaries and hence their employment in India involved a huge expenditure on account of their salaries, pensions and furlough charges. Gokhale pointed out that "a kind of dwarfing or stunting of our race is going on under the present system. We must live all the days of our life in an atmosphere of inferiority and the tallest of us must bend. in order that the exigencies of the existing system may be satisfied. Our administration and military talents must gradually disappear, owing to sheer disuse. till at last our lot as hewers of wood and drawers of water in our own country, is stereo-typed".

The Moderates criticized the disarmament policy of the British Government in India. The Indians were disarmed but the Europeans were allowed to keep their arms. There was an invidious distinction in the application of the principle of the Arms Act between the Indians and the foreigners and the Moderates were very bitter on that score. They pointed out that their loyalty to the British Empire was met by a policy of distrust and suspicion. They maintained that this was one of the root causes of political unrest in the country.

The Moderates were the first to attempt a comprehensive diagnosis of the economic ills from which India was suffering and also suggested remedies for the same. They gave a detailed historical analysis of the slow

deterioration of India in the economic field during the early years of British rule in India. On the basis of statistics, they showed that India had become one of the poorest countries in the world. They attributed this fact to India's growing ruralisation and a constant drain of money from the country. They maintained that the policy of free trade followed by the Government of India was ruinous to the interests of India and a policy of discriminating protection to Indian industries alone was suited to India. The writings of the Moderates like Dadabhai Naoroji, Gokhale, Telang, R. C. Dutt and M. G. Ranade are important in this connection.

The Moderates pointed out that the dogmas of the classical economists were not applicable to India. The view of Ranade was that certain economic doctrines of Adam Smith and Ricardo in their unqualified form were not applicable to India. The economic doctrines which were true in Europe were not true in India to the same extent and could not be applied to Indian conditions. If free trade was suited to England, it could not be said that it suited all countries. The circumstances prevailing in India were different from those prevailing in England. Even in some countries of Europe, the principles applied in England were not considered fit to be aplied in their countries.

The Moderates took pains to emphasize the poverty of the people of India. They also analysed the exact nature and extent of that poverty and the precise causes from which it had arisen. The fact that the economic poverty of India was due largely to economic causes was brought out with a wealth of facts and arguments by men like Ranade and R. C. Dutt.

The Moderates maintained that on account of British domination in India, there was a constant drain of wealth from the country and ultimately the people became very poor. Gokhale maintained that a great and ruinous drain of wealth from India had gone on for years and had impoverished the country. The same was the view of Dadabhai Naoroji.

Heavy expenditure on Indian army was one of the causes of India's poverty. Gokhale told the Welby Commission that the percentage of the expenditure on the army in India was much more than elsewhere. In no other country in the world, the military expenditure absorbed such a large proportion of the income of the Government. Military expenditure "overshadows the whole field of Indian finance and under its chilling shade no healthy development is possible for the people".

The Moderates put before the people of India the ideal of a balanced economic development. They were opposed to the policy which made the Indians depend exclusively on agriculture. They pointed out that previously India clothed herself with her own products and even aspired to clothe people in Europe to some extent, but the situation had completely changed. The present position was that shipping, coastal trade, banking, insurance etc. were all in the hands of the foreigners and the result was disastrous.

The Moderates were opposed to the policy of Laissez faire and advocated the adoption of the policy of protection by the Government of India. They maintained that the policy of the Government of India had been influenced by the Home Government. Newly established industries in India cried for protection. There could not be a fair competition between a dwarf and a giant. To talk of free and equal competition between India

and England was nonsense. Free competition could be welcomed to India only when her own industries were firmly planted on their feet. It was contended that whatever benefitted India economically was bound to benefit the British Empire also. A contented India, a prosperous India, a progressive India would be source of unlimited strength to the British Empire.

The Moderates were critical of the British bureacracy in India whose members had come to constitute a caste with all the exclusiveness and love of monopoly which characterised castes. The uncontrolled power possessed by them impaired their sense of responsibility and made them intolerant of criticism. They were satisfied with their own positions and wanted the people also to be satisfied with theirs. They were opposed to any form of reform in the country. Most of them were the birds of passage. The moment they earned their pensions, they went back home. All the experience they had acquired in India was lost to this country. The officials looked at every question from the point of view of their own power and ignored and sacrificed the interests of the Indians. The existing bureaucratic system shut out the educated Indians from positions of power and responsibility and the result was that on account of sheer misuse of Indian ability, the same was disappearing.

The Moderates demanded not only a better administration but also more democratic Government. Resolutions demanding this change were passed at the annual sessions of the Indian National Congress from the very beginning in 1885.

The critics of the Moderates put emphasis on religious differences in India. The reply of the Moderates was that there were religious differences everywhere in the world. The Roman Catholics and the Dissenters suffered from many disabilities. This was particularly so in Ireland.

The Moderates maintained that the existence of many castes among the Hindus was not an insuperable obstacle to the working of representative institutions in India. There was no danger of the monopoly of all political power by the Brahmanas. A large number of first-rate Indian politicians came from classes other than Brahmanas.

The opponents of Indian nationalism contended that the genius of the East was suitable for a despotic rule and not for free institutions. The Moderates refuted this contention and pointed out the statement of Sir John Lawrence that "the people of India are quite capable of administering their own affairs".

Lord Curzon declared that the Indians were not fit for the responsibilities of high offices on account of their environments. This was repudiated by Surendranath Banerjea who pointed out that Sir Salar Jung, Sir Dinkar Rao, Sir T. Madhav Rao, Dewan Bahadur Raghunath Rao, Sir Vishveshwraya, Sir Prabhashankar Patani and Sir V. T. Krishnamachariar had shown consummate ability in the highest administrative offices. Sir S. P. Sinha and Sir Syed Ali Imam were worthy successors of Sir James Stephen and Sir C. P. Ilbert. The Indians had given an excellent account of themselves as members of the Executive Councils of the Governor-General of India and the Governors, as Presidents of Assemblies, as Vice-Chancellors of Universities and as Chief Justices of the High Courts in India. If they had not done more, "it is their misfortune, not their fault".

The Moderates conceded that self-Government implied capacity for self-defence and India may not be able to organise her own military, naval and aerial defences all at once, but India did not lack martial spirit or martial capacity. Military unfitness of India was not congenital. It was the result of the policy of distrust followed by the Government of India towards the Indians who were deliberately excluded from the armed forces of the country and disarmed.

The Moderates maintained that what was good for India was good for the British Empire and what was good for the British Empire was also good for India. The Moderates asked for the right of self-defence and that of self-Government as those were both in the interests of India and the British Empire. The Moderates never imagined India except as an integral part of the British Empire. They offered unstinted loyalty and asked for unlimited trust. They wanted India to be strong, vigorous, self-reliant and prosperous because India's development demanded it and the British Empire's development implied it. The ultimate foundations of the strength and prosperity of India and the Empire were the same.

The Moderates maintained that the case for self-Government in India rested upon the new spirit that was born in India and was demanding self-expression. The Indians had neither good Government nor self-Government because self-Government was the only guarantee of good Government. If Englishmen found it impossible to swallow the domination of others even when it spelt efficient and better Government, there was no reason why it should be reserved for Indians to accept passively the blessings of a good Government doled out to them by a paternal alien Government. The ideal of self-Government was implicit in English character, English tradition, English literature, English political philosophy, English declarations and charters and the same ideal inspired the youth of India. If Indian character was not to be dwarfed, it must be allowed full autonomy in the political sphere. The people of India must not be treated as babies for ever.

For a long time, the Moderates avoided the task of formulating for themselves the goal of their political activity. Ultimately, they declared that they stood for Swaraj within the British Empire and wanted the preparation of the ground for self-Government in India by an ever-increasing direct participation of the representatives of the Indians in legislation as well as adiminstration, civil as well as military, executive as well as judicial work of the Government. Autonomy within the British Empire was the accepted political faith of the Moderates. They did not want separation from England and absolute independence. Their ideal was one of coordination and comradeship of a joint partnership with Britain on equal terms.

The Moderates were opposed to the introduction of the principle of separate electorates in the politics of India. They maintained that separate electorate would retard the concord and harmony between Mohammedans and Hindus. The Moderates stood for one Indian nation which was above all sectarian and communal differences. They advocated a policy of progressive education, the elevation of all people and the obliteration of lines of caste and creed in the social and political life of the country. They appealed to both the Hindus and Muslims to recognise the essential unity of their lives and sink all petty differences for a common ideal. The Moderates condemned all lawlessness and disorder and pointed out that

repression was no remedy for the evil. Repression had nowhere succeeded and was bound to fail in India also. It had converted prison houses into seats of martyrdom.

The Moderates stood for the assertion of democratic ideals in all spheres of life. They were the first to dream the dream of a democratic state in a democratic society in India. They were pitted against the diehards in the Government and the Extremists in the country. Their loyalty to the British connection was interpreted by the rising intelligentsia of India as a mere flattery of the authorities. They got the nickname of mischievous political agitators at the hands of the British officials. However, they had patience. They had sobriety. They had faith in the greatness of their cause, the good sense of the people and the liberty and justice-loving character of the British Government.

Tht Moderates considered it as their mission to translate the great social and political ideals of the West into the lives and thoughts of the educated people of India and through them of the masses. Those ideals were actually planted in a germinal form on Indian soil by the British administration.

The Moderates always appealed to actual historical facts and declarations and not to abstract sentiments and principles. There was no elaborate discussion about the nature of representative Government or its limitations. The Moderates did not bother about the philosophical basis of their fight. Their utterances were practical and realistic in character.

The Moderates took their stand on the principle of equality which implied equality between Indians and Englishmen. They fought against the principle of racial discrimination in the sphere of justice and the distribution or award of the highest post in the administration and pleaded the case for the Indianisation of the services. They were bitter against the Arms Act which was based on discrimination. They joined the struggle of the Indian emigrants against the colonial Governments because it was a fight against the principle of racial discrimination. They fought for the holding of simultaneous examinations both in India and in England for the Indian Civil Service.

The Moderates fought for liberty both in the political and economic sphere. They wanted liberty of free criticism within certain limits. They wanted the right of free expression in India to the same extent as it was allowed in England.

The Moderates believed that the people of India had become one single nation, with a single purpose and will of its own. Indian nationalism had grown with the growth of the Congress and strengthened with its strength. Indian nationalism had become more and more vocal and more assertive.

The Extremists

The growth of Extremism in Indian politics was the outcome of many circumstances. There was a general feeling that the policy of appeals and prayers followed by the Moderates had brought no tangible results as the Government considered it as a sign of weakness. That led to discontentment. The outbreak of famine in 1897 affected millions of people and the attitude of the Government of India and British bureaucracy was callous.

While the people were in the grip of famine, the Government was busy in celebrating the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria. The money required for the relief of the people was being wasted on needless pomp and show. The outbreak of the Bubonic plague in the Bombay Presidency added to that discontentment. The methods adopted by the Government were highly objectionable and added to the resentment. The revival of Hinduism gave people self-confidence and a determination to revive the glories of the past by manfully building the future. To quote Aurobindo Ghose, "Independence is a goal of life and Hinduism alone will fulfil aspirations of ours". The anti-Indian policy of Lord Curzon added to discontentment and bitterness. The people resented the passing of the Official Secrets Act, the Calcutta Corporation Act and the Indian Universities Act. His partition of Bengal led to widespread agitation not only in Bengal but also in the rest of the country. The treatment of the Indians abroad added to the resentment already existing in the country. The Indians who had been sent to British colonies for their development with big promises were being shabbily treated and subjected to all sorts of indignities. They were "spat upon, hissed, cursed, abused and subjected to a variety of other indignities". The defeat of Italy by Abyssinia in 1896 and of Russia by Japan in 1905 exploded the myth of European superiority and invincibility. It was felt in India that if a European nation could be defeated by an Asiatic power, the Indians also could drive out the British from their country.

It was under these circumstances that the Extremist leaders like Tilak, B. C. Pal, Lala Lajpat Rai and Aurobindo Ghose came to the forefront in Indian politics. They placed before the people new ideas and new ideals different from those of the Moderates. They tried to divert the Indian mind from the policy of dependence upon the British Empire to a new policy of self-help and self-reliance. "No man can give you political salvation. You must win it".

The Extremist leaders gave a new reading of the past history of India. They traced the history of India from the ancient times. They did not consider the Muslim rule in India as a foreign rule as the Muslims settled down in India and made her their home. They were "Indians by birth, Indians by marriage and Indians by death". The Hindus occupied the highest offices during the Mughal rule in India and their Government was an Indian Government and not a foreign Government. The Extremists maintained that India was never a part of another Empire, much less a dependency. She had her own army, her own navy and her own flag. She had her industries and manufactured goods necessary for her consumption. Both things had changed during British rule. The granaries were empty and the fields once so green were dry and parched with thirst.

The Moderates believed that the British Empire had a divine origin and mission. The Extremists maintained that the British Empire was essentially of the earth and had its origin in the humdrum commercial motives and the desire to enrich itself at the cost of India. Its motives were anything but divine. At every stage of the growth of the British Empire in India, there was deceit and chicanery and Mechiavellian diploma. Every treaty was considered as a scrap of paper if it stood in the way of British expansion. The British Empire started as a haphazard plunder and ended as perfectly well organised exploitation. Indian blood was freely poured

and Indian money was freely spent for the conquest of India. It was not a conquest of India by Britain in purely military sense but the same was done through diplomacy, cunning, fraud and force. Thrones were purchased and sold to the highest bidders. Military support was purchased and given like merchandise. Servants were induced to betray their masters and soldiers to desert their flags. Laws of all kinds, whether national or international, moral or religious were thrown to the winds. The only object of the Empire was to loot, to plunder and to make an Empire and everything else was subrodinated to that end.

The Extremists did not agree with the Moderates that India was an integral part of the British Empire as a dependency. The whole of the administration of India was generally in the hands of the foreigners who had absolutely no interest in the country except as servants of the Crown, who were not interested in the welfare of the people.

Unlike the Moderates, the Extremists did not believe that India will grow and prosper under British control, leadership and guidance. They considered the British Empire as essentially a foreign Government which was bound to be hostile to the interests and aspirations of the people of India. A civilised Government was set up by the British in India in order to facilitate the work of the government of a vast country by a few foreigners and there was no benevolence in it. The British did not come to India on a purely altruistic mission to solve the problems of the people of India. The Extremists asked the people of India to give up the illusion of British benevolence, British generosity and British mission of civilsation.

Unlike the Moderates who linked up India inseparably with the British Empire, the Extremists wanted to cut off India from the British Empire. To the Moderates, the British Empire was father, mother, guardian, a friend and a philosopher, but to the Extremists it was an arbitrary infliction, a crude dispensation of fate and a purely repressive and destructive force. The Extremists pointed out that the slaves could not be loyal to their masters. They had to obey as a matter of compulsion and not as a matter of choice. Bondage was bondage. The worst feature of British rule in India was not its force but its cunning diplomacy. The mailed fist was covered by a velvet glove. The Queen's Proclamation of 1858 was meant to serve as a narcotic to dull the political and religious sensibility of the Indians. It was a cloak to cover the despotism of the British. It was the greatest diplomatic stroke of the British people. The Extremists referred to the attempts made by the British bureaucrats like Sir James Stephen to whittle down the Proclamation and explain it away.

The Extremists maintained that the Indians should give up the illusion that British administrators in India will help the Indians to overcome their difficulties. As a matter of fact, they would create new hurdles in their way in order to perpetuate their rule.

Unlike the Moderates who wanted more and more of British administration in India and would like to strengthen it, the Extremists considered foreign Government as pure poison and if that poison was sweet, it was worse for the people. Howsoever pleasant the British Government might look, it could never make for Swaraj.

The Extremists advocated that the religion of loyalty to the British

Empire should give way to the religion of disloyalty to the Empire. The Moderates wanted the Indians to greet and embrance the Empire but the Extremists pointed out that no Indian patriot could serve both the British Empire and his Motherland. The Extremists wanted the Indians to shake off their fear of the foreign Government because with fear there could be no healthy politics in the country.

The Moderates followed a policy of extreme caution and as far as possible hesitated to differ from the Government and the bureaucracy. However, the Extremists demanded a clear-cut declaration of the goal towards which the Indian National Congress was moving. Tilak was prepared to accept a colonial form of self-Government but the Extremists wanted to have complete independence as their goal and demanded the separation of India from the British Empire. The Extremists were able to create a stir in the country because they asked the people to strive for a political objective which captured their imagination. Swaraj became a war-cry, a slogan to fight, work, live and die for.

While the Moderates stood for rational, just, humane and enlightened administration, the Extremists were determined that the people of India must control their own destinies. They preferred any indigenous Government to the most enlightened foreign rule. Their contention was that the Government of India by Great Britain was a huge and costly failure and had no justification whatsoever. No nation had the right to make a slave of another nation. Great Britain boasted of taking a leading part in the abolition of slavery in the world but she was responsible for enslaving a country like India where millions of human beings were deprived of their elementary rights and liberties. Autocracy of Britain had killed the public spirit among the Indians. British autocracy regulated and controlled every aspect of the life of the Indians.

The Extremists maintained that the interests of Britain were radically different from and opposed to those of India and the two could not coexist. They were similar to the interests of the cat and the mouse. India was a valuable asset to the British Empire because she offered field for investment of British capital. She also supplied raw materials and bought finished products from Britain. She offered the best training ground for the intellect and character of England. If the Indians took the place of Englishmen in higher services, there could be no scope for British talent. The loss of one country was the gain of the other. The Extremists demanded Swaraj which involved separation from Britain. The Swaraj movement was not only a political or economic movement, it was also a social and spiritual movement.

The view of the Moderates was that the whole period of British rule was a period of political apprenticeship for the Indians and they must deserve before they desired self-Government. Tilak maintained that the Indian nation had ceased to be a tender child. It had grown up and hence demanded that the management of its affairs be transferred into the hands of the Indians. The Extremists declared that the British were in India not for training the Indians but for their own business and the real training of the Indians fundamentally conflicted with that business.

The Extremists declared that they had absolutely no faith in the altruistic mission and liberal declarations of the British Government. That

faith had been killed in them by Lord Minto, Lord Morley and Lord Curzon. There was complete despair and disillusionment among the people towards the British Government.

The Extremists appealed to the people of India for inspiration, for guidance and for the attainment of their political objectives and thereby turned the academic movement of the Congress into a mass movement. "Our eyes have been turned away from the Government, away from the Houses of Parliament, from Simla and Calcutta, and our faces have turned now to the starving, the naked, the patient and long-suffering 300 million of Indian people, and in it we see a new potency, because we view them now with an eye of love which we had never felt before, and in the teeming toiling, starving and naked population of India, we find possibilities, potentialities, and germs that have given rise to the movement, namely, Faith in the people, Faith in the genius of the nation, Faith in God who has been guiding the genius of this nation through ages by historical evolution, Faith in the eternal destiny of the Indian people."

The nationalism of the Extremists was not merely a civic, economic or political idea. It was a religion. It was essentially a religious ideal which inspired the patriots of India to sacrifice their all at the altar of their country. The new nationalism was determined to make itself felt and asked the people to sacrifice their lives for the country. The Moderates considered it as a thoughtless cult and madness which would bring ruin to the country.

The Extremists did not rely wholly upon material weapons. They relied upon God and felt that as long as there was an intense faith in God, everything was bound to be alright in the end. The Extremists stood for a new mentality in the country which was necessary for getting Swaraj and also running it.

Unlike the Moderates who believed that the regeneration of India would come from outside, the Extremists believed that the revival of the nation could come from within. Faith can move mountains and the new nationalism of the Extremists was built on such a faith. That faith was something deeper, wider and more powerful than the promise of industrial or economic development and political independence.

The Moderates were timid, hesitating, calculating and always balancing loss and gain. They had not real force of conviction behind them. New natioanalism demanded unlimited faith, self-sacrifice and courage. Self-interest had no place in it. The Extremists kindled a new faith in men and asked them to realise God in the nation and in their fellow countrymen.

The Moderates got their inspiration from the West and borrowed all their ideals and methods from the British. The Extremists looked more to the great past of India and derived their inspiration from it. The new cry was "Bande Mataram" and not "Long Live the King". The new patriotism was concrete and racy of the soil. There was love for India and all that India had.

The Moderates believed too much in the British hearts, British good sense, British conscience, British liberal tradition and British pledges. The Extremists maintained that if the salvation of India was to come from Britain by the transformation of public opinion in that country towards India,

the same was an impossible task. The minds of the Englishmen were closed against the Indians by their self-interest.

Unlike the Moderates who accepted the existing Government in India as a Government constituted by law and whose laws must be obeyed in the higher interests of the Government and the existing social order, the Extremists accepted those laws as long as they respected the primary rights of citizenship. They appealed to the theory of natural rights of men to vindicate their position while defying the law.

The people of India had been led to believe that they were weak, they were divided, they could not maintain peace and law and order and they could not withstand the foreign invader if the British withdrew. The Extremists tried to remove the above feeling from the minds of the people and gave them a message of hope and strength. They placed before them the ideal of Swaraj in order to remove despair from their minds. They placed before them the new ideal of the Mother, their own country. They called upon them to place all their energy and devotion at the feet of their country. They tried to change their old psychology and prepare them for the battle of their country.

The Extremists told the people that the history of India had to be rewritten. The history of India was not merely a long story of Hindu slavery and Hindu idiocy. Its great event was not the Battle of Plassey. The history of India "is to the patriot what the scriptures of his religion are to the devotee. Indian history is the record of the dealings of God with the Indian people". The Extremists appealed to the people of India to glorify in their greatness in the past and also become as great as they were before.

The Extremists started the Swadeshi movement to arouse the people to make sacrifices for their country. The people were asked to use only Swadeshi things and not anything which was of foreign origin. The Swadeshi movement brought national self-respect, national prestige, manliness and self-help.

The Extremists also advocated a policy of boycott to fight against the British Government. The boycott movement profoundly affected the psychology of the people of India. It gave the motive and the driving force to the Swadeshi movement. It was a war cry which thrilled the people and carried them off their feet.

The Extremists condemned the existing system of education in the country and advocated a policy of national education. It was pointed out that the officially controlled educational system in India was shallow and rootless. It was articfial because it was foreign both in sprit and form. It destroyed the very springs of national life and energy and taught the people of India to depend upon the British Government and foreign culture for their existence. It was a demoralising system in every way.

The great contribution of the Extremists was that they revived and emphasized the great idea that India was a single country, she had a great and glorious past, her present and future culture could grow on the basis of that great past, Indian nationality existed from times immemorial and would assert itself in its own way in the modern world and develop itself on the lines peculiar to its genius.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Argove, Daniel : *Moderates and Extremists in the Indian Nationalist Movement* (1883-1920), Asia, 1967.

Banerjea, Surendranath : *A Nation in the Making*, London, 1925.

Buch, M.A. : *Rise and Growth of Indian Liberalism*, Baroda, 1938.

Chirol, Sir Valentine : *Indian Unrest*, London, 1910.

Ghose, Sankar : *The Renaissance to Militant Nationalism in India*, 1969.

Ghose, P.C. : *The Development of the Indian National Congress*, 1892-1909, Calcutta, 1960.

Gupta, Atulchandra : *Studies in Bengal Renaissance*, Calcutta, 1958.

Krishna Rao, M.V. : *The Growth of Indian Liberalism in the Nineteenth Century*, Mysore, 1951.

Majumdar, B.B. : *Militant Nationalism in India*, Calcutta, 1966.

Majumdar, B.B. & B.P. : *Congress and Congressmen in the Pre-Gandhian Era*, 1885-1917, Calcutta, 1967.

Majumdar, R.C. : *History of the Freedom Movement in India.*

Mehrotra, S.R. : *Towards India's Freedom and Partition*, New Delhi, 1979.

Mitter, B.L. : *Extremists and Moderates : A Study.*

Moore, R.J. : *Liberalism and Indian Politics*, 1872-1922, London, 1966.

Mukherjee, Haridas and Uma : *The Growth of Nationalism in India* (1857-1905), Calcutta, 1957.

Mukherjee, Haridas and Uma : *Bande Mataram and Indian Nationalism* (1906-1908), Calcutta, 1957.

Mukherjee, Haridas and Uma : *The Origins of the National Education Movement* (1905-1910), 1957.

Mukherjee, Haridas and Uma : *Bipin Chandra Pal and India's Struggle for Swarrj*, 1958.

Mukherjee, S.N. (Ed.) : *The Movement for National Freedom in India*, Oxford, 1966.

Naik, V.N. : *Indian Liberalism : A Study*, Bombay, 1945.

Naik, V.N. : *A History of Indian Liberal Party*, Allahabad, 1960.

Pal, B.C. : *The Spirit of Indian Nationalism*, London. 1910.

Pal, B.C. : *Swadeshi and Swaraj : The Rise of New Patriotism*, Calcutta, 1954.

Rao, B. Shiva : *India's Freedom Movement*, New Delhi, 1972.

Sarkar, Sumit : *The Swadeshi Movement in Bengal*, New Delhi, 1977.

Shay, T.L. : *The Legacy of Lokmanya*, London, 1956.

Shukla, B.D. : *A History of the Indian Liberal Party*, Allahabad, 1960.

Singh, H.L. : *Problems and Policies of the British in India* (1885-98), London, 1963.

Singh, Sita Ram : *Nationalism and Social Reform in India* (1885-1920), Delhi.

Tripathi, Amales : *The Extremist Challenge : India Between* 1890 *and* 1910, Orient Longmans, 1967.

Tucker, Richard P. : *Ranade and the Root of Indian Liberalism*, Bombay, 1977.

Wolpert, S.A. : *Tilak and Gokhale : Revolution and Reform in the Making of Modern India*, Berkeley, 1962.

CHAPTER VII

Dadabhai Naoroji (1825-1917)

Dadabhai Naoroji was affectionately called the Grand Old man of India. He was universally loved and adored by the people as the Father of Indian Nationalism and the Herald of self-governing India. His name comes first in the list of those Indian patriarchs who "beginning his connection with the Congress from its very outset, continued to serve it till the evening of his life and took it through the whole gamut of evolution, from the humble position of being a people's organ seeking redress of administrative grievances to that of a National Assembly working for the definite object of attaining Swaraj". Gokhale once observed : "If ever there is the divine in man, it is in Dadabhai Naoroji". Justice Ranade once said of Dadabhai that he was only in three hundred millions. Pherozeshah Mehta wrote in a letter to the Bombay Gazette in January 1969 that "if I were called upon to point out the man deserving to be styled the Sir Philip Sydney of the Indian Renaissance, I would unhesitatingly single out Professor Dadabhai.." To Dadabhai, Gandhiji once said, "Please chide me if I go wrong, please put me right, I am like your son in every respect". Digby compared him to John Bright, stating that "Mr. Naoroji had done that for Indian politics which steam power had accomplished for traction purposes."

Dadabhai was born on 4 September 1825. During his college days, he was the pride of his Professors and fellow students. Acadamic honours crowned his career giving an indication of his vigour of intellect and clearness of thought and judgement. Prof. Orlevar called him "The Promise of India". On account of his genius, Sir Erskine Perry, Chief Justice of Bombay and President of the Board of Education, offered to stand half of the cost of his trip to England for the study of law and return to the Bar but the proposal was not accepted. He was very much influenced by the heroic idealism of William Wilberforce. Thomas Clarkson and Zachary Macaulay.

In November, 1851, he started the Rast Guftar (Truth Teller) and through its columms he preached the gospel of truth and humanity. In cooperation with some other members, he founded the Bombay Association in 1852. In 1854, he was appointed Professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy in the Elphinstone College, Bombay. From 1855 to 1859, he worked with the Camas in London. On 24 March 1865 was founded the London Indian Society "for the purpose of discussing all political, social and literary subjects relating to India and adopting such measures as may be necessary to acquaint the public in England with the views and feelings of people of India on all principal questions that may arise from time to time". Dadabhai was elected its President. On 1 October 1866, the East India Association was founded in London "for the independent and disinterested advocacy and promotion of the public interests and welfare of the inhabitants

of India generally". Dadabhai did his best to make the East India Association speak for India as a whole. In 1873, Dadabhai gave evidence before the Fawcett Select Committee on Indian Finance. In 1874, he was the Dewan of Baroda. In 1875, he became a member of the Bombay Corporation. He played an important part in the foundation of the Indian National Congress in 1885. One could see his hand in the drafting of all the resolutions passed at that session. In 1886, he was the President of the Congress at the Calcutta session.

At the age of 62 in 1887, Dadabhai decided to go to England to fight an election to the House of Commons and although he failed in his first attempt, he was elected to the House of Commons in 1890 from the constituency of Central Finsbury as a Liberal Member and he was a Member of British Parliament from 1890 to 1895. He presided over the Lahore session of the Indian National Congress held in 1893. At that session, Dadabhai declared, "Let us always remember that we are children of our mother country. Indeed, I have never worked in any other spirit than that I am an Indian and owe duty to my work and all my countrymen. Whether I am a Hindu or a Mohammedan, a Parsee, a Christian or any other creed, I am above all an Indian. Our country is India. Our nationality is Indian."

When the Welby Commission was appointed to enquire into the question of Indian expenditure in 1895, Dadabhai was invited to join the Commission as a member and he submitted many notes to the Commission. He presided over the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1906. It was in that session that resolutions on Swaraj, boycott, Swadeshi and national education were passed. Dadabhai ended his Presidential address with these words: "I do not know what good fortune may be in store for me during the short period that may be left to me, and if I can leave a word of affection and devotion for my country and countrymen, I say : "Be united, persevere and achieve self-Government so that the millions now perishing by poverty, famine and plague, and the scores of millions that are starving on scanty subsistence may be saved and India may once more occupy her proud position."

At the age of 81, his health broke down due to over-strain and he returned to India permanently on 11 October 1907 and afterward lived a life of retirement. He died on 30 June 1917. On his death, Sir Narayan Chandavakar observed, "If we take stock of his life and his example, may I not say with perfect justice and truth that in his carrier, in all he did, in all he suffered, and in all he taught, he was the Prophet Zoroaster's religion personified, because he was the man, more than anybody else, of pure thought, of pure speech and of pure deeds. .Dadabhai lived and worked for us with a devotion which must remain for all of us an inspiring example."

His Views about British Rule in India

In the early stages of his career, Dadabhai had sincere faith in the blessings of the British rule in India. He sincerely believed that the British would treat India as a sacred charge entrusted to them. In one of his letters to Louis Mallet, Under Secretary of State for India, Dadabhai wrote thus on 13 September 1880 : "There is a deep conviction among educated and thoughtful Natives that if there is any one nation more than another on the face of the earth that would on no account knowingly do a wrong to, or enslave, degrade or impoverish people, and who, on feeling the conviction

of any injury having been unintentionally done by them, would at once, and at all reasonable sacrifice, repair the injury without shirking, that nation is the British nation. This conviction keeps the thinking Natives staunch in their loyalty to the British rule. They know that a real regeneration, civilisation, and advancement of India materially, morally, and politically depends upon a long continuance of the British rule. The peculiarly happy combination of high civilisation, intense love of liberty, and nobility of soul in the British cannot but lead them to the desire of the glory of raising a vast nation, instead of trampling upon them. This noble desire has found expression from some of their best men. The English people have a task before them in India for which there is no parallel in the history of the world. There has not been a nation who, as conquerors, have like the English, considered the good of the conquered as a duty, or felt it as their great desire; and the Natives of India may, with the evil of the present drain stopped, and a representative voice in the legislation, hopefully look forward to a future under the British rule which will eclipse their greatest and most glorious day."

In his Presidential address at the session of the Indian National Congress held in 1886, Dadabhai declared that the Indians were loyal to the backbone. He was so enthusiastic about the various blessings of British rule in India that he wanted the British to prolong their stay in India until they had completed their sacred trust. It was because of this feeling that he exhorted the people of India to "go on united and earnest, in concord and harmony, with moderation, with loyalty to the British rule and patriotism towards our country." He sincerely believed that "the day, I hope, is not distant when the world will see the noblest spectacle of a great nation like the British holding out the hand of true fellow citizenship and of justice to the vast mass of humanity of this great and ancient land of India with benefits and blessings to the human race". He also believed that the interests of India and England were allied and not antagonistic. He believed that "If we do really ask what is right and reasonable, we may be sure, that sooner or later, the British Government will actually give what we ask for. We should, therefore, persevere having confidence in the conscience of England and rest assured that the English nation will grudge no sacrifice to prove the sincerity of their desire to do whatever is just and right".

In his Presidential address delivered at the Lahore session of the Indian National Congress held in 1893, Dadabhai declared, "We desire that the British connection should endure for a long time to come for the sake of our material and political elevation among the civilised nations of the world. It is no pleasure or profit to us to complain unnecessarily or wantonly about this poverty. Were we enemies of British rule, our best course would be not to cry out, but remain silent and let the mischief take its course till it ends in disaster as it must. But we do not want the disaster and we therefore cry out, both for our own sake and for the sake of the rulers" In the same address, Dadabhai declared, "I, for one, have not the shadow of a doubt that in dealing with such justice-loving, fair-minded people as the British, we may rest fully assured.. have always believed that the time will come when the sentiments of the British nation and our gracious Queen's Proclamation of 1858 will be realised".

While appreciating the good the British had done in India, Dada-

bhai did not hesitate to point out the evils also that had come in its wake. In a paper read before the East India Association in 1867 on "England's Duties to India", Dadabhai posed the question, "Is British rule in India a benefit to India and England?" His own reply was that under the British rule, "as the country is being continually bled, its vitality and vigour must get low, unless permanent improvements already made or future development of the material resources shall restore it to its former health." In 1876, he pointed out that "owing to this one unnatural policy of British rule of ignoring India's interests and making it the drudge for the benefit of England, the whole rule moves in a wrong, unnatural and suicidal groove". About the economic aspect of British rule in India, Dadabhai observed, "The romance is that there is security of life and property in India. The reality is that there is no such thing. There is security of life and property in one sense or way, i.e., the people are secure from any violence from each other or their native despots. So far, there is real security of life and property and for that India never denies her gratitude. But from England's own grasp, there is no security of property at all and as a consequence no security for life. India's property is not secure. What is secure and well secure is that England is perfectly safe and secure and does so with perfect security, to carry from India and to eat up in England her property at the present rate of some £ 3,00,00,000 or £ 40000000 a year. The reality therefore is that the policy of English rule as it is (not as it can and should be), is an everlasting, increasing and everyday increasing foreign invasion, utterly, though gradually, destroying the country. The present position of English rule in India has, moreover, produced another most deplorable evil from which the worst of old foreign invasions was free. That with the deprivation of £ 30,00,0000 or £ 40,00,0000 a year, the whole higher wisdom of the country is also carried away. I therefore venture to submit that India does not enjoy security of her property and life and also of knowledge or wisdom. To millions of India, life is simply half-feeding or starvation, or famines and disease".

At a meeting held on 28 December 1897 under the auspices of the London India Society, the following resolution was passed at the instance of Dadabhai: "That of all the evils and terrible misery that India has been suffering for a century and a half and of which the latest developments are the most deplorable, famine and plague, arising from ever-increasing poverty, the stupid and suicidal Frontier War and its savagery of the wholesale destruction of villages, unworthy of any people, but far more so of English civilisation, the unwise and suicidal persecutions for sedition, the absurd and ignorant cry of the disloyalty of the educated Indians and the curtailment of the liberty of the Indian press, the despotism and the general insufficiency and inefficiency of the administration: of all these and many other minor evils the main cause is the unrighteous and un-British system of Government which produces an unceasing and ever-increasing bleeding of the country and which is maintained by a political hyprocrisy and continuous subterfuges, unworthy of the British honour and name and entirely in opposition to the wishes of the British nation and the sovereign. That unless the present unrighteous and un-British system of Government is thoroughly reformed into a righteous and truly British system, destruction to India and disaster to the British Empire must be the inevitable result."

In 1898, Dadabhai wrote, "The authorities are openly throwing aside

their mask and hypocrisy of benevolence and the people, on the other hand, are beginning to feel that somthing is wrong and a fierce struggle is in prospect." At a gathering of the London India Society on 1 June 1904, Dadabhai declared: "There is only one remedy to the present dishonorable, hypocritical and destructive system—a system that would break up the Empire if not saved by a peaceful revolution. The remedy is self-Government under British paramountcy. When this one fundamental remedy will be accomplished, every other evil or defect of the present system would right itself." At the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1906, Dadabhai again referred to the evil consequences of British rule in India in the form of poverty, famine, plague and starvation.

In his Memorandum to the Select Committee on East India Finance in 1897, Dadabhai had asked: "Does India, even at the present day, produce enough to supply, without hardship or privation, both its ordinary wants as a nation and its extraordinary peculiar wants, to remit to a foreign distant country, a portion of its produce as the natural economical result of foreign rule? I say that India does not produce enough even for the ordinary necessary wants of its children much less for all their social and peculiar political wants." Dadabhai agreed with the view of Duke of Devonshire and Sir William Hunter that India was insufficiently administered and the poverty of the country made even the moderate amount of expenditure a crushing burden. To quote Dadabhai, "And is it not a great condemnation of the British administration of Indian expenditure that the people of India cannot make any wealth—worse than that, they must die off by millions, produce a wretched produce and that even somebody else must deprive them of a portion."

In the same Memorandum, Dadabhai stated, "The English rulers boast and justly so that they have introduced education and Western civilisation into India, but on the other hand they act as if no such thing had taken place and as if all the boast was pure moonshine. Either they have educated or they have not. If they deserve the boast, it is a strange self-condemnation that after half a century and more of such efforts, they have not yet prepared a sufficient number of men fit for the service of their own country. Take even the Education Department itself. We are made B.A.s and M.A.s, M.D.s etc.; with the strange result that we are not yet considered fit to teach our countrymen. We must yet have forced upon us even in that Department, as in every other, every European that can be squeezed in." Another charge against the Government was that while large sums of money were squandered on imperialistic wars on the borders of India, the funds allotted for education, agriculture and industry were very little. The result was that both the amount of public expenditure and the manner of incurring it, had the effect of depriving the people of India of their "wealth, work and wisdom" and made them "degradingly deteriorated and debased, crushing out of them their very manhood".

Dadabhai also pointed out that the tax burden in India was unbearable. The gravity of the burden could be judged from the income of the tax-payer. An Indian paid 15% of his meagre income to the Government in taxation and an Englishman only 8% of his much higher income of £30 per annum. To pay a tax of even £2-10s out of an income of £30 per annum was much less a burden than to pay 6s out of an annual income of

40s which did not suffice even for the purchase of the bare necessaries of life.

Dadabhai was also critical of the public debt of India which had increased from Rs. 94.56 crores in 1860-61 to Rs. 312 crores in 1901-2. The public debt of India was due to the cost of the wars which the English East India Company waged in India, the cost of the Revolt of 1857, the payment of share capital to the shareholders of the English East Company at the time of the transfer of Indian Government to the British Crown in 1858, the cost of the Burma and Afghan wars and similar other expenditure charged to India's account. This public debt of India was responsible for heavy taxation of the people of India which resulted in hardship and discontentment against the Government. Dadabhai told the British : 'No prophet is required to foretell the ultimate result of a struggle between a discontented two hundred millions and a hundred thousand bayonets. A drop of water is insignificant but an avalanche may sometimes carry everything before it. The race is not always to the swift. A disaffected nation may fall a hundred times and may rise again, but one or two reverses to a foreigner cannot but be fatal. Every failure of the natives, adding more burdens, will make them the more impatient to throw off the foreign yoke".

The same Dadabhai who was so eloquent about the blessings of the British rule in India, became its great critic towards the end of his life. He began to say that the beneficial, benevolent and philanthropic nature of British rule was in reality a myth. In 1904, he described the British rule as barbaric and in 1906, he declared that India stood for Swaraj or self-Government within the British Empire.

Drain Theory

Dadabhai was the high priest of the drain theory and for years he carried on propaganda in its favour. In his paper entitled "England's Debt to India" read in 1867 in London, Dadabhai put forward the idea that Britain was extracting wealth from India as the price of her rule in India, that "out of the revenues raised in India, nearly one-fourth goes clean out of the country and is added to the resources of England" and that India was consequently "being continuously bled". Dadabhai reaffirmed his views regarding the moral and material drain from India in his two Essays entitled "The Wants and Means of India" and "On the Commerce of India" written in 1870 and 1871. In 1873, Dadabhai prepared the first draft of his Essay on "Poverty of India". By 1876, the drain theory was fully crystallised in his mind and was presented in its entirety in a revised draft of "Poverty of India". His conclusion was that on account of this economic drain, the British rule was moving in a wrong direction.

Dadabhai's best exposition of his drain theory is to be found in his book entitled "Poverty and Un-British Rule in India". In that book, Dadabhai included all his scattered papers and pamphlets, correspondence with state officials, evidence before Committees and Commissions, speeches and addresses on the subject together with extracts from old State papers, statutes and proclamations. The result was a somewhat chaotic compilation, a bulky book in a red cover containing nearly 700 pages of statements and speeches extending over a period of nearly 30 years.

The view of Dadabhai was that the economic drain was the real, the principal and even the sole cause of the loss, sufferings and poverty of India, all other reasons and causes being "only red herrinsg drawn across the path". He maintained that the drain facilitated penetration and exploitation of India by foreign capital. By preventing the accumulation of capital within India and by thus prostrating internal capital, the drain permitted foreign capitalists to come to India without having to face any indigenous competition and thereby to monopolise and to reap, all the advantages of India's material resources. The drain also acted as the chief source of accumulation of foreign capital invested in India because a large part of the drain was brought back to India as foreign capital. Dadabhai went to the extent of declaring that the entire evil of the drain was due to the excessive employment of Englishmen in Indian administration. To quote him, "The sole cause of this extreme poverty and wretchedness of the mass of the people is the inordinate employment of foreign agency, the Government of the country and the consequent material loss to and drain from the country." Again, "It is a question of life and death to the country. Remove this one evil and India will be blessed in every way".

Dadabhai made a comparison between the British rule in India and previous rulers of this country. It was pointed out that although the Mughals and the Marathas plundered the people of India, their wealth remained within the country and was spent inside it. Individual citizens might suffer or be oppressed and deprived of their wealth, but the country as a whole did not lose, the loss of one citizen being the gain of the other. As regards the British rule, Englishmen took wealth out of the country and spent it abroad. Under the old rulers, even if the burden of taxation was very heavy, the economic effects were not as disastrous for the people as the effects of taxation under the British because then all the money realised from taxes was spent in India. In the case of the British Government, the same was sent out of India. Even when invaders like Nadir Shah, came, they looted the country and went back immediately and the loss of wealth was temporary. In the case of British rule, the drain was a part of the existing system of Government and was therefore ceaseless and continuous, increasing from year to year. The wounds were kept perpetually open and the drain was like a running sore. The former rulers of India were like butchers chopping irregularly here and there but the mechanised efficiency of England was cutting the very heart of the country almost with sharp surgical knives. To quote Dadabhai, "The lot of India is a very sad one. Her condition is that of a master and slave: but it is worse; it is that of a plundered nation in the hands of constant plunderers with the plunder carried away clean out of the land. In the case of the plundering raids occasionally made on India before the English came, the invaders went away and there were long intervals and security during which the land should recuperate and became again rich and prosperous. But nothing of the kind is true now. The British invasion is continuous and the plunder goes right on with no intermission and actually increases and the impoverished Indian nation has no opportunity whatever to recuperate."

The drain theory of Dadabhai referred to the vast amount of wealth taken away from India to England in different forms. The most important part of that drain was that the British officers and employees working in the army, civil servants of the railways and the British lawyers, doctors,

businessmen etc. remitted a portion of their salaries, incomes and savings to England. Another element in the drain was the amount paid to the British official isn the form of pensions and furlough allowances by the Indian Government. To quote Dadabhai, "The sole cause of this extreme poverty and wretchedness of the mass of the people is the inordinate employment of foreign agency in the Government of the country and the consequent material loss and drain from the country.... It is a question of life and death to the country."

Another major source of the drain was the Home Charges of the Government of India or the expenditure incurred in England by the Secretary of State for India. The Home Charges included interests on the Indian public debt and guaranteed railways, cost of military stores and other stores supplied to India, the civil and military charges paid in England on account of India, the cost of the Secretary of State's establishment at the India Office and the payment of pensions and allowances to European officials of the Indian Government. Another major source of the drain was the profits and dividends of private foreign capital invested in trade, industry or plantations in India. Dadabhai had earlier ignored this source of drain and thought that foreign capital could be a source of rapid economic development in India but after 1876 he attacked foreign capital as a source of drain.

In the words of Dadabhai, "This drain consists of two elements—first, that arising from the remittances by European officials of their savings and for their expenditure in England for their various wants both there and in India; from pensions and salaries paid in England and from Government expenditure in England and India. And the second, that arising from similar remittances by non-European officials. As drain prevents India from making any capital, the British by bringing back the capital which they have drained from India itself, secure almost a monopoly of all trade and important industries and thereby further exploit and drain India, the source of the evil being the official drain."

In his evidence before the Welby Commission, Dadabhai observed: "If we were free to accumulate our own capital fully we should be able then to compete on equal and fair terms with the foreign capital coming in and there would be perhaps more benefit than evil by the foreign capital. At present we suffer it as an evil because we are helpless and on the ground, and foreign capital comes in and develops the resources for their benefit and carries away the whole profit that is obtained out of these resources. We are simply used as common labourers, mere hewers of wood and drawers of water. That is the only position to which we are reduced."

Dadabhai gave expression to similar sentiments in these words: "In India in the construction of the rail road, a large amount of loan goes towards the payment of the Europeans a portion of which, as I have explained before, goes out of the country. Then, again, in the working of the railways there is the same drawback, leaving therefore hardly any benefit at all to India itself and the whole interest of the loan must also go out of the country. So our condition is a very anomalous one—like that of a child to whom a fond parent gives a sweet but to whom in its exhausted condition, the very sweet acts like poison, and, as a foreign substance, by irritating

the weak stomach makes it throw out more, and causes greater exhaustion. In India's present condition, the very sweets of every other nation appear to act on it as poison".

Efforts were made by Dadabhai to calculate the exact amount of drain from India. In 1867, he estimated the drain to be £ 8 millions. In 1870, he raised the figure to £ 12 millions. In 1876, he published the following table in "The Poverty of India":—

Years	Yearly Average (£)
1835 to 1839	5,347,000
1840 to 1844	5,930,000
1845 to 1849	7,760,000
1850 to 1854	7,458,000
1855 to 1859	7,730,000
1860 to 1864	17,300,000
1865 to 1869	24,600,000
1870 to 1872	27,400,000

In 1893, Dadabhai calculated the drain to be more than Rs. 25 crores a year. In 1897, he put this figure at about Rs. 359 crores for the ten years from 1883 to 1892. The smallest amount was Rs. 241 crores or Rs. 24 crores a year. In 1905, he declared that nearly 34 million sterling or Rs. 51.5 crores worth of Indian produce was being drained out of India annually.

As regards the consequences of the drain, Dadabhai's view was that it was the sole cause of the improvement of the Indian people. It subjected India to a ceaseless process of economic destruction and deprived her of vital material blood and incapacitated her for productive purposes. The drain resulted in not only the loss of wealth but also the loss of capital. The transfer of national wealth had an important and harmful effect on income and employment within India. The drain represented not only the spending abroad of a certain part of our national income but also the further loss of employment and income that would have been generated inside the country through investment.

Dadabhai also pointed out that what the Europeans consumed in India caused a partial loss to the Indian people because it deprived the Indians of the goods and services which were used by them. The drain was particularly injurious because it deprived India of its potentially productive capital. The drain was checking and retarding the accumulation of capital to a foreign country. The drain not only cut into the current national savings but also decreased the existing stock of inherited national capital in India by exporting a large portion of its currently accumulated capital to a foreign country. The drain not only cut into the current national saving but also decreased the existing stock of inherited national capital. In his speech in the House of Commons on 12 February 1895, Dadabhai stated that as a result of the drain capital was withdrawn from India and the Indians were prevented from accumulating it. This compulsorily obtained advantage to England crippled the resources of the Indians who could never accumulate any capital in their own country. In his evidence before the Welby Commission in 1897, Dadabhai repeatedly emphasized the capital formation aspect of the drain which deprived India of its potential capital and provided England with additional productive capital at the ex-

pense of India. The view of Dadabhai was that if India was allowed to retain its resources instead of being bled by the foreign Government, she would be able to pay in taxation Rs. 2000 millions. Dadabhai pointed out that the drain by producing scarcity of capital in the country, obstructed its rapid industrial development. He ironically pointed out that while the Englishmen were sweeping away our valuable capital, they raised up their hands and wondered why we could not develop industry. He denied that the Indians were unwilling to invest their capital in industry. The fact was that they did not possess sufficient capital for investment. Dadabhai also pointed out that while the drain had been a source of loss of capital to India, it had proved to be a major source of capital accumulation to England where it had "fructified" and helped in the rapid industrialisation of the country.

Dadabhai contended that this accumulated capital could proliferate like a giant and could be used for further drain. To quote him, "Hitherto India's wealth above the surface of the land has been drained away to England; now wealth under the surface to the land will also be taken away and India lies prostrate and unable to help herself.. And great will be the sounding of the trumpets of the wealth found in India and the blessings conferred on India just as we have sickeningly dinned into our ears day after day about railways, foreign trade etc."

Dadabhai made certain concrete suggestions to avoid the economic drain. He suggested that the inhabitants of India should themselves develop the resources of the country and may also draw upon English capital, Many of the items charged on Indian revenues should be met out of the British Exchequer. The financial relations between India and England should be properly investigated and put on a moral and just basis. India should be assisted in becoming a good customer of Britain rather than remain a subject nation. Dadabhai explained the motive behind his suggestions in these words: "My whole earnest anxiety is that righteous means may be adopted by which the connection between the two countries may be strengthened with great blessings and benefits to both countries. Righteousness alone will exalt a nation. Injustice will bring down the mightiest to ruin".

It is to be noted that the drain theory changed the attitude of Dadabhai towards the British Government in course of time. He attributed the lack of industrial growth and the poverty of India to the economic drain. He also criticised the benefits of the security of life and property and law and order as guaranteed by the British Government. He became a great critic of the British Government. However, when the World War I started, Dadabhai appealed to his countrymen to stand by the side of British Government.

Industrialisation of India

The view of Dadabhai was that India needed industrialisation on a large scale. The drain of India's wealth to England entitled her to demand capital from England on easy terms for the development of her trade and industry. The infant industries in India were smothered in the name of free trade. If the drain of wealth was brought within reasonable limits, India was prepared to accept the doctrine of free trade. Dadabhai invited

British capital for the development of the resources of India but he pleaded that the Indians should be helped in doing so and not handicapped as was actually the case. To quote him, "For some time, therefore, and till India, by a change in the present destructive policy of heavy European agency, has revived, and is able to help herself in a free field, it is necessary that all great undertakings which India herself is unable to carry out for developing the resources of the country, should be undertaken by the State, but carried out chiefly by native agency by preparaing Natives for the purpose. Then will India recover her blood from every direction. India sorely needs the aid of English capital; but it is English capital that she needs, not the English invasion to come also and eat up both capital and produce."

Free Trade

Like a true Liberal, Dadabhai believed in free trade, but he realised that free trade is possible only between countries which have equal command over their own resources. As that was not the condition in India free trade was disastrous for her. According to him, free trade between India and England was "something like a race between a starving, exhausting invalid and a strong man with a horse to ride on." India would be prepared for free trade in case the economic drain from India was brought within reasonable limits. He supported the Swadeshi movement on the ground that it was a "forced necessity for India in its unnatural economic muddle".

His Political Liberalism

The philosophy of Dadabhai is summed up in the phrase "political liberalism". Unlike Raja Rammohan Roy whose dominant motive was social and religious reform, the ruling passion of Dadabhai was the political and economic betterment of India. He was mainly occupied with political problems. He opposed the view of Ranade that social reforms should be brought within the purview of the Indian National Congress and insisted that the Congress must remain a purely political body and should leave social problems to other organisations. The Congress should confine itself only to those questions in which the entire nation was interested and in which all could participate.

Dadabhai was a liberal in his political philosophy. He believed that liberty or freedom is one of the basic requisites of good life. He considered the sacred word "free" as representing the noblest aspiration that can animate the best of men. He claimed freedom as the right of every Indian as a citizen of the British Empire. To quote him, "Britain is the parent of free and representative Government and we as her subjects and children are entitled to inherit the great blessings of freedom and representation." He believed that the denial of basic minimum liberties to the Indians was un-British and un-Christian in character. He wanted the Indians to be appointed in the various Departments of the Government. He wanted the holding of competitive examinations for the Indian Civil Service simultaneously in India and England in order to enable the Indians to share in the administration of the country. At the very first session of the Indian National Congress held in 1885, Dadabhai emphasized the neces-

sity of reforming the Legislative Councils and associating more and more Indians with them. In 1906, he demanded that a systematic beginning be made towards the development of full legislatures for self-Government like those of the self-governing colonies. He rejected the British contention that the Indians must first deserve and then desire. His reply was, "It is futile to tell me that we must wait till all the people are ready. The Brtiish people did not so wait for their Parliament. We are not allowed to be fit for 150 years. We can never be fit unless we actually undertake the work and the responsibility".

Indianisation of Services

Dadabhai demanded the Indianisation of the services in India. That was necessary not only to lessen the poverty of India but also to satisfy the aspirations of the educated classes in India. The employment of the foreigners on a large scale resulted in material loss and drain to the country. To quote Dadabhai, "Every European displaced an Indian who should fill that post. In short, the evil of the foreign rule involved the triple loss of wealth, wisdom and work." Dadabhai also observed that "just as the administration of the United Kingdom in all Departments..is in the hands of the people of that country themselves, so should we in India claim that the administration in all services, departments and details should be in the hands of the people of India themselves".

Secular Nationalism

Dadabhai was one of the founders of secular nationalism in India. His view was that one of the important pre-requisites for the gain of Swaraj or Self-Government for India was a thorough political union among the Indians of all creeds and classes. To quote him, "All the people in their political position are in one boat. They must sink or swim together. Without this union, all efforts will be vain."

Constitutional Methods

Dadabhai advocated only constitutional methods for the achievement of the goal of self-Government in India. That did not mean merely making petitions and representations to the authorities but also involved a great deal of earnestness and sacrifice on the part of the Indians. He wanted them to learn from the British people the lesson of persistent and continuous agitation. To quote him, "What is wanted for us is to learn the lesson from the British themselves to agitate most largely and most perseveringly by petitions, demonstrations and meetings, all quite peacefully but enthusiastically conducted.. Agitation is the life and soul of the whole political, social and industrial history of England. It is by agitation that the English have accomplished their most glorious achievements, their prosperity, their liberties and, in short, their first place among the nations of the world. The whole life of England, every day, is agitation. Agitation is the civilised peaceful weapon of moral force and infinitely preferable to brute physical force when possible."

In 1906, Dadabhahi said, "Our faith and future are in our hands. If we are true to ourselves and to our country and make all necessary sacrifices for our elevation and administration, I for one have no shadow of

doubt that in dealing with such justice-loving, fair-minded people as the British, we may rest assured that we shall not work in vain."

Dadabhai's concept of constitutional agitation was more comprehensive than that of Gokhale and Pherozeshah Mehta. In his constitutional agitation, there was room for Swadeshi and boycott.

Dadabhai maintained that the policy of prayers and petitions was not one of mendicancy. To quote him, "These petitions are not any begging for any favours any more than that the conventional 'your obedient servant' in letters makes a man an obedient servant. It is the conventional way of approaching higher authorities. .The petitions are claims for rights or for justice or for reforms to influence and put pressure on Parliament by showing how the public regard any particular matter."

Hyndman ridiculed what he described as a policy of spineless agitation carried on by the people of India and asked Dadabhai to follow a policy of revolt against the British Government. This was not approved of by Dadabhai who still believed that British connection with India was a blessing for both countries. Dadabhai's attitude is clear from the following statement made by him on 1 November 1898 at the Annual Dinner of the London India Society: "We still believe that the British people have a conscience. We look to them for justice and I hope the time will come, although I may not have the good fortune to live to see it, when all things will be changed and Her Majesty's best wishes realised."

Imperialism

Dadabhai was opposed to imperialism as it resulted in destruction and brought untold miseries and sufferings to the people. In his book entitled "Poverty and Un-British Rule in India" Dadabhai warned the British in these words: "After having a glorious history of heroic struggles for constitutional Government, England is now rearing up a body of Englishmen in India, trained up and accustomed to despotism with all the feelings of impatience, pride and high-handedness of the despot becoming gradually ingrained in them, and with the additional training of the dissimulation of constitutionalism. Is it possible that such habits and training of despotism with which British officials return from India, should not, in the course of time, influence the English character and institutions? The English in India, instead of raising India, are hitherto themselves descending and degenerating to the lower level of Asiatic despotism. Is this a Nemesis that will in fullness of time show to them what fruit their conduct in India produced? It is extraordinary how nature may revenge itself for the present unnatural course of England in India, if England, not yet much tainted by this demoralisation, does not, in good time, check this new leaven that is gradually fermenting among her people."

On 11 February 1898, Dadabhai wrote to George Freeman, "Really the prospect for the British Empire does not look very bright if the present infatuation for keeping other nationalities under heels is persisted in. It is the most effectual way in which they are digging their own grave. At present in India they are going from bad to worse and wiping off whatever merit there was in the British name by Russianizing the system of repressing freedom of speech and liberty of the subject." On

25 August 1898, Dadabhai wrote again to George Freeman who had referred to the growing sea power of England, "England's only strength, if she is wise enough to see it, against all Europe is the contentment, prosperity and desire of India herself to keep up England's connection. England can then command a resource of strength that can defy all Europe.... India is England's greatest friend and its greatest weakness as she would have it".

Moral basis of Political Power

Dadabhai had deep-rooted faith in the moral foundations of political authority. According to him, the foundation of political power must be on good faith and mututal trust and not on bayonets and scalps. At the Lahore session of the Congress in 1893, Dadabhai declared, "You can build up an empire by arms or ephemeral brute physical force but you can preserve it by the eternal moral force only. Brute force will sometimes or another, break down; righteousness alone is everlasting". The real basis of political power is the union of hearts, feelings and sentiments. "To suppose that their Civil Service or the British people could have any other safety than that which arose from the satisfaction of India, was to deceive themselves. Whatever might be the strength of their military force, their true security in the maintenance of their rule in India depended entirely on the satisfaction of the people. Brute force may make an empire, but brute force would not maintain it; it was moral force and justice and righteousness alone that would maintain it." The view of Dadabhai was that England should govern India for the good of India and make British rule a blessing for the Indians. The policy of "gagging and disarming" will not succeed in the long run.

His Socialistic Leanings

Dadabhai recognised the growing political and economic force of international socialism and sought cooperation from the socialists in England. Hyndman was one of his close friends. He had sympathy for the working class. He was in touch with the Labour Members of British Parliament. He told the working classes in England that if he was returned from the North Lambeth constituency, he would be an additional Labour Member. In a meeting held at Holborn Townhall, he moved a resolution demanding a universal system of old age pensions. In his pamphlet entitled "The Rights of Labour", he advocated the establishment of Industrial Commissioner's Courts. He attended the International Socialist Congress at Amsterdam in August 1904 as a representative of the people of British India. There he made a speech on the economic drain of India during the British rule and the consequent poverty of the people. The report of the Congress was propagated all over the world and Dadabhai had the satisfaction of seeing that his appeal on behalf of India attracted considerable attention. Dadabhai vindicated the claim of labour as property.

However, he differed from Karl Marx. It is true that both Dadabhai and Marx were conscious of the fact that the British were tools in the hands of the Manchester interests, but they differed in their views regarding the intention of the Britishers over Indian finances. The view of Marx was that the British wanted India as a market for their commodities. The view of Dadabhai was that the British wanted India as much for the investment

of their capital as for the disposal of their goods. Dadabhai wanted British capital to compete on fair and equal terms and not enjoy monopoly position.

Dadabhai was the first Indian political thinker to understand the basic reality of our colonial political economy. He noticed the developing contradictions which were inherent in the social, economic and political conditions of India under British rule. He did not belong to any particular school of political and economic thought. His ideas were not derived from any single intellectual source. He may be called the founder of a distinct Indian school of thought. His great contribution was his analysis of the drain of wealth and capital from India to England. He claimed two types of rights for the Indians as British citizens—birth rights and pledged rights. He advocated the immediate implementation of the right of Indians to employment in public services and representation in the legislatures. He also moralised politics.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Appadorai, A. : *Indian Political Thinking in the Twentieth Century from Naoroji to Nehru*, Oxford, 1971.

Digby, W. : *Prosperous British India.*

Masani, R.P. : *Dadabhai Naoroji : The Grand Old Man of India*, London, 1939.

Masani, R.P. : *Dadabhai Naoroji*, Publications Division, Government of India, New Delhi, 1960.

Naoroji, Dadabhai : *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*, London, 1901.

Naoroji, Dadabhai : *Speeches and Writings.*

Naoroji Papers : Dadabhai Naoroji Memorial Trust, Bombay (NP).

CHAPTER VIII

Sir Pherozeshah Mehta (1845-1915)

Sir Pherozeshah Mehta was one of those stalwarts who were associated with the Indian National Congress from its very birth. He had the good fortune to play a leading role in moulding the policy and programme of the Congress for about three decades. He was the leader of the Moderates and he fought to the last against the Extremists. He was their target at the Surat session of the Congress in 1907. He controlled the Congress so successfully that so long as he lived, there was no chance for the Extremists to re-enter the Congress.

Pherozeshah Mehta was born on 4 August 1845 and he died in November 1915. He was a very precocious boy. He graduated from the Elphinstone College, Bombay in 1864 at the age of 19 and within six months passed his M. A. with honours. He went to England to study law and spent four years there. He became a barrister in 1869. It was during his stay in England that he came into intimate contact with Dadabhai Naoroji, W. C. Bonnerjea and Badruddin Tyabji and this association continued for decades. While in England, he was very much influenced by the ideals and doctrines of Liberalism and those governed his public career and political conduct in India.

On his return from England, he started practice in the High Court of Bombay and soon made a mark for himself in the profession. He took keen interest in the affairs of the city of Bombay and he made Bombay "a little kingdom" and the pride of India. It was due to his efforts that the Acts of 1872 and 1888 were passed for the city of Bombay. Those Acts gave a lot of freedom to the Corporation of Bombay. The Act of 1888 is known as the Magna Carta of municipal freedom. Pherozeshah Mehta was known as the "Lion of Bombay."

Pherozeshah Mehta was one of the founders of the Bombay Presidency Association in January 1985 and he took active interest in its affairs. In 1985, he became a member of the Bombay Legislative Council. He was elected to the Imperial Legislative Council thrice and could have continued if he so desired.

Pherozeshah Mehta was a great educationist. He was not only a member of the Senate of the University of Bombay but he actually took keen interset in higher education. He was a pioneer of Swadeshi concerns. He gave to Bombay its first Indian Daily in English in 1913 with B. G. Horniman as its first editor. In the same year, he made a historic pronouncement that no subject of the Crown could be denied the right of free entry and access to any part of the British Empire.

It is said about him that he dominated the Bombay Corporation, the Bombay University and the Bombay Legislative Council. His fabulous

practice at the Bombay Bar, his princely mode of life and travel at home and abroad marked him out from his contemporaries. He was intolerant of criticism, quick to take offence and did not know how to apologise. He had winsome manners and he could enliven any company with the charm and versatility of his conversation. If he felt insulted, he became "Pherozeshah, the ferocious" and roared like a lion.

British dignitaries, including several Governors of Bombay, learnt to their cost that it did not pay to provoke Pherozeshah Mehta. They disliked him and tried to discredit and dislodge him. However, Pherozeshah Mehta knew how to deal with them. When Pherozeshah Mehta was outvoted by the permanent official majority in the Legislative Council or in the meetings of the Corporation of Bombay, he took the controversy to the daily press of Bombay and made his opponents look ridiculous. On the floor of the Legislative Chamber, he asked for no quarter and gave none. It is said that once Sir George Clarke, the Governor of Bombay, said to Pherozeshah Mehta from his Presidential chair, "Two minutes more, Sir Pherozeshah." Before taking his seat, Pherozeshah Mehta replied, "Two minutes, Your Excellency, I cannot use those two minutes better than by recording an emphatic protest against the way you use your power." On another occasion, Pherozeshah was cut to the quick by the arrogance of an official member in the Bombay Legislative Council and he exclaimed, "The Hon'ble Mr. Logan has expressed offensive statements in particularly offensive language. I resent it strongly and I throw it back in his face."

Whatever their true feelings, the critics of Pherozeshah took care to behave with great decorum in his presence. At the turn of the century, even leaders like Tilak and Lajpat Rai approached Pherozeshah with due deference.

Pherozeshah was called "the uncrowned king of Bombay" and on occasions he behaved as if he was a king. In 1903, he resembled King Canute trying to hold back the tides of change. He was almost in exclusive control of the office of the Indian National Congress in Bombay. His friend, Dinshaw Wacha, was the Secretary of the Congress. The control of the Central Congress Organisation during the years 1894—1904 by Pherozeshah was almost as effective as that of Mahatma Gandhi in the 1920's and 1930's. At the annual sessions, his lead was followed, whether or not he himself was present.

Attitude towards new ideas

Pherozeshah was opposed to new ideas which were considered as a nuisance by him. He was already one of the busiest men in the country. rationing his time between his legal practice, work in the Bombay Corporation, the Bombay University and the Legislative Council, besides the Indian National Congress. He did not like murmurs of dissent whether in the Subjects Committee or at the plenary sessions of the Indian National Congress. He was insensitive to new forces emerging in the country. He was even hostile towards them. He had no patience with leaders like Tilak, Lajpat Rai and Aurobindo Ghose. He had no doubt that he could outargue, outwit and outvote them in the Congress. He was called over-weening by his critics. He was even described as a "dead weight." However, nothing could change his view that the Congress should continue to work on the lines followed by it since 1885.

Relations with Ranade

Pherozeshah Mehta had great regard for Ranade and called him his friend. On occasions, he took pride in proclaiming his agreement with him purposefully and to make his statement more weighty. They were also colleagues in the Bombay Legislative Council till Ranade was appointed a Judge of the High Court of Bombay. Pherozeshah often quoted Ranade as authority in speeches and sometimes went out of his way to pay him a compliment. In 1895, he spoke of Ranade's "great talents and varied accomplishments which are devoted to the service of his country with an untiring zeal and unflagging perseverance which are equalled only by the simplicity of his heart and the nobility of his mind." Ranade counted on Pherozeshah as the most reliable and intrepid of his associates in public work.

Attitude towards British Rule

Pherozeshah believed that through the mechanism of British rule, the concepts of freedom and individual dignity were being introduced in India. As the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Indian National Congress session held at Bombay in 1904, Pherozeshah Mehta observed: "Let me lay before you the confession of faith of a devout and irreclaimable Congressman like myself. I am an inveterate, I am a robust optimist like my late friend Mahadeva Govinda Ranade. I believe in divine guidance through human agency. It may be the fatalism of the East, but it is an active, not a passive fatalism, a fatalism which recognizes that the human wheels of the machinery must actively work to fulfil their appointed task. My humility saves me from the despair that seizes more impatient souls like those who have recently preached a gospel of despondency—I always seek hope and consolation in the words of the poet: 'I have not made the world and He that has made it will guide.' I derive patience from the same poet's teaching: 'My faith is large in time, and that which shapes it to some perfect end.' My steadfast loyalty is founded upon this rock of hope and patience. Seeking the will of Providence, like Oliver Cromwell, in dispensations rather than revelations, seeing God's will like him in fulfilment of events, I accept British rule, as Ranade did, as a dispensation so wonderful, a little island set at one of the world establishing itself in a far continent as different as could be, that it would be folly not to accept it as a declaration of God's will."

There was a school of politicians in England who held the view that India had been won by the sword and could be retained only with the help of the sword. Pherozeshah refuted that view. To quote him, "In preaching this gospel of might with regard to the Government of this country, they have found a devoted supporter in England in Sir Fitzjames Stephen and a somewhat doubtful one in Lord Salisbury. They ridicule the policy of righteousness as one of weak sentiment and seem almost to adopt, with scarcely disguised approval, the vigorous summary of their position given recently by Mr. Bright in his own peculiarly happy manner, that having won India by breaking all the Ten Commandments, it is too late now to think of maintaining it on the principles of the Sermon on the Mount."

On Force

Pherozeshah advanced three reasons why force should not be emphasized.

India maintained by England by the power of her arms would be a heavy burden on her in case of her being involved in European complications. The policy of force "would require day by day larger English armies and larger English civil services and in progress of time large numbers of Englishmen trained in the maxims of despotism and saturated with autocratic predilections would return to their native home, where they could not but look with intolerance on free and constitutional forms." With "a policy of force the resources of India would be drained in the first instance in maintaining large costly armies and huge services; the country would be thus too impoverished to admit of her developing the great material resources which Nature has showered on her. In India, impoverished and emasculated, the English merchant would only be an emasciated attendant in the rear of the English soldier and the English civilian, and English commercial enterprise, more glorious even than her military enterprise, would find no congenial field." "Englishmen don't do justice to themselves when they read Indian history in this way though it cannot be denied that there are many pages in this history blotted by error and crime. England has won India not simply by the sword, but in a large measure by the exercise of high moral and intellectual qualities which have not only guided its victories, but have always been on the alert to neutralize its baneful influences."

Faith in Englishmen

Pherozeshah had faith in the sense of justice of the Englishmen. To quote him, "I have no fears that English statesmanship will ultimately respond to the call. I have unbounded faith in the living and fertilizisg principles of the English culture and English education." He held the view that "all the great forces of English life and society, moral, social, intellectual, political, are, if slowly, yet steadily and irresistibly declaring themselves for the choice which will make the connection of England and India a blessing to themselves and to the whole world for countless generations. I appeal to all true Englishmen—to candid friends as to generous foes—not to let this prayer go in vain". However, he gave a warning that "England must raise India to her own level or India will drag her down to hers".

In his Presidential address at the Calcutta session of the Congress held in 1890, Pherozeshah observed thus : "I have unbounded faith in the living and fertilizing principles of English culture and English civilization. It may be that, at times the prospect may look dark and gloomy. Anglo-Indian opposition may look fierce and uncompromising. But my faith is large, even in Anglo-Indians.... the higher nobler nature which, in the end, must prevail and which has prevailed in so many honourable, distinguished and illustrious instances.....When, in the inscrutable dispensation of Providence, India was assigned to the care of England, one can almost imagine that the choice was offered to her as to Israel of old : 'Behold I have placed before you a blessing and a curse; a blessing, if ye will obey the commandments of the Lord your God; a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God but go after other Gods whom ye have not known.' All the great forces of English life and society, moral, social, intellectual, political, are, if slowing yet steadily and irresistibly, declaring themselves for the choice which will make the connection of England and India a blessing to themselves and to the whole world for countless generations. Our

Congress.....asks but to be allowed to join in the blessing which England will as surely earn as there is an 'Eternal that marketh for righteousness.'"

Pherozeshah believed in loyalty to the Crown asd the permanence of the British Empire. He was opposed to leaders like Tilak and Aurobindo Ghose who did not believe in constitutional methods and would like to fight against the British Government.

Pherozeshah was opposed to centralisation and he was in favour of giving more and more powers to the local bodies in India.

Education

Pherozeshah was an advocate of intellectual and moral education. To quote him, "There is no doubt that an intelligent and educated population is the best means of developing indefinitely the resources of a country. On the Continent this idea has of late gained immense ground. It was first started by those grand statesmen of the French Revolution, even as they were hurling defiance and armies at a coalition of almost all the crowned heads of Europe. And though the original plans of Condorcet and Robespierre fell through the time, yet ever since France, Germany, Italy and Switzerland have been sparing no efforts, even in times of trouble and difficulty, to reconstruct their system of public education under the direct administration, management and support of the State."

Pherozeshah was a true Moderate. He believed in the policy of prayers and addresses to the British Government and hoped that England would do Justice to India. He believed in a policy of patience and perseverance and not one of revolt.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Chintamani, C.Y. (Ed.) : *Speeches and Writings of Sir Pherozeshah Mehta*, 1905.

Mehta Papers : This collection is in the possession of Sir Homi Mody, Bombay. *Microfilm copy*, National Archives of India and University of Cambridge.

Mody, H.P. : *Sir Pherozeshah Mehta. A Political Biography.* 2 Vols. Bombay. 1921.

Srinivasa Sastri, V.S. : *Life & Times of Pherozeshah Mehta*, Madras, 1945.

CHAPTER IX

R. C. Dutt (1848-1909)

R. C. Dutt occupies a unique position. He was a great intellectual, nationalist and administrator. He presided over the Lucknow Session of the Indian National Congress held in 1899. He made himself famous by making the statement that "there is no better way of creating sedition than by suppressing free discussion in newspapers and meetings." He is famous for his **Letters to Lord Curzon** and his **Economic History of India.** The former fixed the public opinion in India and nobody cared to consider the answers of Lord Curzon. "That settles it" was the general feeling. He did a lot of pioneer work which helped the growth of the nationalist movement in the country.

He was born in 1848 and he died in November 1909. He joined the Indian Civil Service in 1869 after coming out successful in the competitive examination held in London. He was posted in Bengal where he worked as Joint Magistrate, Magistrate and Commissioner. He was the first Indian to serve as a District Magistrate for a long period. He was the first Indian to be appointed the Commissioner of a Division. In 1897, he resigned from the Indian Civil Service, nine years before he was due to retire. Many reasons have been given for his resignation. One reason was his failing health. Another reason was that he wanted to devote himself whole-heartedly to literary pursuits which he always called his "first love." Another reason was that he desired greater independence and opportunities for political work for India.

After his retirement, R. C. Dutt settled down in London. According to his biographer, the main objects of his mission in England were the following:—

(1) To form and organise an Indian party of sympathetic Englishmen in England.

(2) To influence the British Parliament through prominent members of the House of Commons.

(3) To educate the British public in Indian subjects and to win their sympathy and support.

(4) To appeal to the wider world of Europe through literature and history.

In 1898, he was appointed Lecturer in Indian history at the University College, London. During 1898 and 1899, he was chiefly engaged in his translations of Mahabharata and the Ramayana. In December 1899. he presided over the session of the Indian National Congress at Lucknow.

Early in 1900, he wrote a series of open letters to Lord Curzon about land revenue settlements in various Indian provinces. In December 1900, he associated himself with a number of retired Anglo-Indian Administrators and submitted a joint memorial to the Secretary of State for India demanding reasonable restrictions on land assessments in India. All through his stay in England, he was engaged in delivering speeches and reading papers on Indian affairs. The speeches and papers of 1901 and 1902 deal, for the most part, with subjects like economic conditions in India, famines, and the land question and with agriculture and manufactures. The Economic History of India appeared in two volumes. The Preface to the first Edition of the First Volume entitled "The Economic History of India Under Early British Rule," was written in December 1901 and that of the First Edition of the second volume entitled "The Economic History of India in the Victorian Age" was written in December 1903. About his Economic History, it is said that "It was the crowning work of Romesh Dutt's patience, industry and literary ability. It was a lucid history of the industries, trades and manufactures of India. It was the last word on the history of land settlement." R. C. Dutt rendered yeoman service by writing his Economic History of India. The revelations made by him made a deep impression upon the Indians and paved the way for Swadeshi movement. It facilitated the success of the movement by preparing the minds of the people. Aurobindo Ghose wrote, "Without the Economic History, and its damning story of England's commercial and fiscal dealings with India, we doubt whether the public mind would have been ready for the boycott. In this one instance, it may be said of him that he not only wrote history but created history."

In 1904, R. C. Dutt became the Revenue Minister of Baroda. In 1907, he was appointed a member of the Royal Commission on Decentralisation. On his return to India in March 1909, he was appointed the Dewan of Baroda but he died in November 1909.

R. C. Dutt wrote both in English and Bengali. In 1872, he published his first book entitled "Three Years in Europe." In 1875, he published "The Peasantry of Bengal" in which he depicted the sufferings of the cultivators in Bengal. 1877, he published a short history of Bengali literature under the title of "Literature of Bengal." During 1885-87, he published the Bengali translation of the Rigveda. He also published nine volumes of Hindu Sastras consisting of the texts and their Bengali translations. During 1889-90, he published "History of Civilisation in Ancient India" in three volumes. He wrote six novels in Bengali, four of which were historical dealing with events comprising a century of Mughal rule from the reign of Akbar to that of Aurangzeb.

R. C. Dutt was the first distinguished economic historian of modern India. He attributed the poverty of India to the exploitation to which she was subjected under the foreign rule. Referring to the intense poverty of the Indian people under British rule, R. C. Dutt wrote, "The poverty of the Indian population at the present day is unparalleled in any civilised country; the famines which have desolated India within the last quarter of the ninteenth century are unexampled in their extent and intensity in the history of ancient and modern times. By a moderate calculation the famines of 1877 and 1878, of 1889 and 1892, of 1897 and 1900, have carried

off fifteen millions of people. The population of a fairsized European country has been swept away from India within 25 years. A population equal to half of that of England has perished in India within a period which men and women, still in middle age, can remember."

About the causes of the poverty of India and repeated famines, the view of R. C. Dutt was that those could not be explained by the theory that India was over-populated or that her population had increased too rapidly. To quote him, "It was said that the population increased rapidly in India and that such increase must necessarily lead to famines; it is found on inquiry that the population has never increased in India at the rate of England and that during the last ten years it has altogether ceased to increase."

R. C. Dutt pointed out that under early British rule, the industry and agriculture of India declined. He wrote, "It is unfortunately a fact which no well-informed Indian official will ignore, that in many ways, the sources of national wealth in India have been narrowed under British rule. India in the eighteenth century was a great manufacturing as well as a great agricultural country and the products of the Indian loom supplied the markets of Asia and of Europe. It is unfortunately true that East India Company and the British Parliamest, following the selfish commercial policy a hundred years ago, discouraged Indian manufacturers in the early years of British rule in order to encourage the rising manufacturers of England. Their fixed policy, pursued during the last decades of the nineteenth century, was to make India subservient to the industries of Great Britain, and to make the Indian people grow raw produce only, in order to supply material for the looms and manufactories of Great Britain. This policy was pursued with unwavering resolution and with fatal success; orders were sent out to force Indian artisans to work in the Company's factories; commercial Residents were legally vested with extensive powers over villages and communities of Indian weavers; prohibitive tariffs excluded Indian silk and cotton goods from England; English goods were admitted into India free of duty or on payment of nominal duty."

R. C. Dutt referred to the unsound principles of taxation followed by the Government of India in these words: "In India, the Land Tax is not only heavy and uncertain, but that the very principle on which it is raised is different from the principle of taxation in all well-administered countries. In such countries the state promotes the accumulation of wealth, helps the people to put money into their pockets, likes to see them prosperous and rich, and then demands a small share of their earnings for the expenses of the state. In India, the state virtually interferes with the accumulation of wealth from the soil, intercepts the incomes asd gains of the tiller and generally adds to its land revenue demand at each recurring settlement, leaving the cultivator permanently poor."

R. C. Dutt criticised the excessive Home Charges. He pointed out that "each nation reasonably expects that the proceeds of taxes raised in the country should be mainly spent in the country. Under the worst Governments that India had in former times, this was the case. The vast sums which Afghan and Moghal emperors spent on their armies, went to support Indian people. The gorgeous palaces and monuments they built, as well

as the luxuries and displays in which they indulged, fed and encouraged the manufacturers and artisans of India. Under wise rulers as under foolish kings, the proceeds of taxation flowed back to the people and fructified their trade and industries. But a change came over India under the East India Company. They considered India as a vast estate or plantation, the profits of which were to be withdrawn from India and deposited in Europe. They reserved all the high appointements in India for their own nominees and exacted a high interest on their stock-in-trade. The Home Charges including pay of European officers who monopolised all the higher services, rose gradually with excessive taxation, so much so that they were approximately half of the net revenues of India in 1901 and were 44 million sterling in total. Verily, the moisture of India blessed and fertilized other land."

R. C. Dutt concludes by saying, "For one who has himself spent the best and happiest years of his life in the work of Indian administration, it is ungracious and a painful task to dwell on the weak side of that administration, the financial and economic policy of the Indian Government. I have undertaken this duty because at the present moment the economic story of British India has to be told and the deep-seated cause of the poverty of the Indian people has to be explained. Place any other country under the same conditions with crippled industries, with agriculture subject to a heavy and uncertain Land Tax and with financial arrangements requiring one-half of its revenues to be annually remitted out of the country and the most prosperous nation on earth will soon know the horrors of famine."

R. C. Dutt said in 1898 that "military people sometimes asserted that India was conquered and held by the sword", but he himself maintained that "India was won by good Government and held by good Government". In the last century when the central power of the Mughal Emperors had gone to pieces, when lawless free-booters swept through the country, when one state warred against another state and one tribe warred against another tribe, British power appeared on the scene as the one power which could give the country peace and rest and settled Government and a just administration. The people saw this and spontaneously gave their support to that power.

In August 1897, a suggestion was made by R.C. Dutt that Great Britain should pay a share of the military expenditure incurred in India to the extent that maintenance of the army also served the imperioal interests of Britain. His view was that it was not impossible to ascertain roughtly what proportion of the military expenditure of India was incurred for England's imperial purposes and the defence of her distant possessions in Africa and in Asia. He also pointed out that when India passed under the direct rule of the Crown, a pledge was given that the cost of wars outside India would not be charged to India.

R.C. Dutt was a great admirer of Ranade and his work which he watched from a distance and jointly worked with him whenever possible. In 1899 after he was free from his duties as President of the Congress, he came to the Social Conference. Ranade requested him to move the resolution on Hindu-Muslim unity and R.C. Dutt readily agreed to do so considering it as an honour to take part in those proceedings. He believed that the Social Conference was doing a lot of good.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Dutt, R.C. : *The Economic History of India*, 2 Vols. Delhi, 1960 ed.

Dutt, R.C. : *The Peasantry of Bengal*, Calcutta, 1874.

Dutt, R.C. : *England & India*, London, 1897.

Dutt, R.C. : *Rambles in India during Twenty-Four Years*, 1871 *to* 1895. Calcutta, 1895.

Dutt, R.C. : *Three Years in Europe*, 1868 *to* 1871, *with an Account of Subsequent Visits to Europe in* 1886 *and* 1893. Calcutta. 1896.

Government of India, Publications Division : *R.C. Dutt.*

Gupta, Atulchandra : *The Life and Work of R.C. Dutt.*

Gupta, J.N. : *Life and Work of Romesh Chandra Dutt*, London, 1911.

8—17 127

CHAPTER X

Surendranath Banerjea (1848-1925)

In the words of B. C. Pal, "The one fact that stands out, above all things else in the life and work of Surendranath Banerjea, is that he occupies a front place among that glorious band headed by Raja Ram Mohan Roy, whom history will proclaim to the future generations of this and other lands as the Regenerators of modern India." He was one of our nation-builders. He lived through the rise of Indian nationalism and exercised a major influence on its early growth. He spearheaded numerous campaigns and movements for constitutional and political reforms in the country. He played a major role in the history of modern India and made his mark in the annals of the Indian national movement. He had a wonderful memory from which he could reproduce page after page without any mistake. He was elected twice the President of the Indian National Congress.

Surendranath was born in 1848 in Calcutta and died on 6 August 1925. He was a brilliant student throughout. He was a prizeman every year, in the College and in the University. He went to England at the age of 20 and passed the open competitive examination for the Indian Civil Service in 1869. However, his name was removed from the list of successful candidates on the ground of a discrepancy in age. He moved the Queen's Bench, fought his case and won. On 22 November 1871, he started his official career as Assistant Magistrate at Sylhet. He had hardly worked for more than a year when he was again disqualified on account of some technical offence. Ultimately, he was dismissed from the Indian Civil Service on a monthly pension of Rs. 50.

When Surendranath came back to Calcutta in June 1875, he had a strong feeling that he had suffered because he was an Indian, "a member of a community that lay disorganised, had no public opinion and no voice in the counsels of their Government." He also felt that the personal wrong done to him was "an illustration of the helpless impotency of our people."

At the instance of Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar, Surendranath joined the Metropolitan Institution as Professor of English. Later on, he joined the Free Church College on the invitation of the Principal of that College. In 1882, he took over charge of a high school which became the nucleus of the Ripon College. Surendranath believed in "the play of a living magnetism between the teacher and the taught." He also believed that while politics was "more or less ephemeral", educational work had in it "the elements of permanent utility." Surendranath became a hero of the students community. His oratory was instrumental in attracting thousands of students to the meetings addressed by him and they were willing to carry out his orders and suffer for their actions. He put before them the ideals of Mazzini who had played an important part in bringing about the unification of Italy.

Surendranath Banerjea had a hand in the establishment of the Indian Association in 1876. When the maximum age limit for the Civil Service Examination was lowered from 21 to 19 in 1877, there were loud protests in India. The Indian Association organised a national protest against the Government. A big public meeting was held at Calcutta. Surendranath Banerjea went on a tour of India with the object of creating a strong public opinion. Against the step taken by the Government, he addressed public meetings at Agra, Lahore, Meerut, Ambala, Delhi, Kanpur, Lucknow, Banaras and Aligarh. The tour was a great success and Surendranath Banerjea was welcomed everywhere.

The Indian Association also carried on agitation against the Arms Act and the Vernacular Press Act and in favour of the protection of tenants from oppression by the Zamindars. The Indian Association also played an important part in the controversy regarding the Ilbert Bill in the time of Lord Ripon.

Surendranath Banerjea played an important part when the first meeting of the National Conference was held in Calcutta in 1883. In 1885, he sent invitations for the second National Conference as the Secretary of the Indian Association. Although he was ignored by the sponsors of the first meeting of the Indian National Congress held at Bombay in 1885, he showed his magnanimity of mind by agreeing to merge the National Conference into the Indian National Congress.

Surendranath Banerjea understood the importance of the Press and he used it "as a great instrument of propagandism". In 1879, he became the proprietor and editor of The Bengalee. In 1900, he made it a Daily. His association with the Bengalee ended in 1920 when he became a Minister under the Montford Reforms.

Surendranath Banerjea rose to the greatest height in life while working in the Congress. There was no other Congressman who was so regular in attending all the meetings of the Congress held from year to year. He was the Congress President in 1895 and 1902.

Surendranath Banerjea was a great Parliamentarian. From 1893 to 1901, he sat in the Bengal Council. From 1913 to 1918, he was a member of the Imperial Legislative Council. He was elected to the Calcutta Corporation in 1876 and continued to be its member for very many years. In 1890, he went as a member of the Congress delegation alongwith R. N. Mudholkar, E. Norton and A. O. Hume to tour England and create public opinion in favour of reforms in India. In 1897, he gave evidence before the Welby Commission on Government Expenditure. He represented India on the Imperial Press Conference in 1910.

In 1918, he left the Indian National Congress and set up a new organisation known as the Indian National Liberal Federation and became its President. He fought the first elections held under the Montford Reforms and became a Minister of Local Self-Government. In 1921, he was knighted. When elections were held in 1923, he was defeated. On 6 August 1925, he died.

Morals in Politics

Surendranath Banerjea was inspired by the career and teachings of Mazzini. He learnt from him that moral and spiritual regeneration alone

can be the foundation of political advancement. The practice of virtue is essential in every noble work. He also learnt from the great Italian patriot that the inhabitants of a country must be moved by deep sentiments and feelings of nationality. He emphasized the importance of morals in politics in these words: "Politics based upon religion or deep moral earnestness is the one thing that is needful for this country. Politics divorced from a high moral purpose becomes the paltry squabble for power in which humanity can feel no interest. Take the case of the Home Rule agitation. Withdraw from it the personality of Mr. Gladstone and his intense moral earnestness, withdraw from it the deep fervour of the Irish patriots, and it becomes a miserable struggle for political power in which the deeper interests of humanity are lost sight of. Take again the case of the Pilgrim Fathers, the founders of American greatness...They preferred exiles to the miseries of a life where their conscientious convictions had to be sacrificed. They developed themselves into statesmen, and became the founders of noblest Government and the freest race that the world has ever seen." Again, "I desire to place the moral consideration in the forefront; that which is morally indefensible cannot be politically expedient. Politics divorced from morality is no politics at all; it is political jugglery of the worst description. It is not for one moment to be supposed that the semi-civilized races (the reference is to the Chitral Expedition), who have thus been treated, whose forbearance and neutrality was secured by a promise made to be broken, are insensible to the binding character of a moral obligation. They will feel the wrong and the insult; they will brood over the injustice which, in the words of Carlyle, never fails to revenge itself with compound interest."

Swadeshism

Surendranath Banerjea had a very high ideal of Swadeshi. It was not only a political and economic movement but also a moral and spiritual movement. To quote him, "Swadeshism will save us from famine and pestilence and the nameless horrors which follow in the train of poverty. Take the Swadeshi vow and you will have laid broad and deep the foundations of your industrial and political emancipation. Be Swadeshi in all things, in your thoughts and actions, in your ideals and aspirations. Bring back the ancient days of purity and self-sacrifice. Restore the Aryavarta of olden times when the Rishis sang the praises of God and did good to men. All Asia is astir with the pulsations of a new life. The sun has arisen in the East. Japan has saluted the rising sun. That in its meridian splendour will pass through our country.....Swadeshi does not exclude foreign ideals or foreign learning or foreign arts and industries, but insists that they shall be assimilated into the natoinal system, be moulded after the national pattern and be incorporated into the life of the nation. Such is my conception of Swadeshism."

Self-Government

Surendranath Banarjea was a great advocate of self-Government. He justified the necessity for self-Government on three main grounds. In the first place, the efficiency of the administration should improve with self-Government. According to him, self-Government was the only guarantee for good Government in socially progressive communities. The well-

known aphorism of Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman that good Government was no substitute for self-Government, was only a half truth. Banerjea felt that it contained an implied admission that self-Government might not result in good Government. He agreed that good Government is no substitute for self-Government, but he maintained that "self-Government is necessary for good Government and we claim it for the purpose of good Government."

Surendranath Banerjea expressed the second ground for necessity of self-Government in these words: "It is our mission to become once the spiritual guides of mankind, but we cannot fulfil that mission unless and until we ourselves are emancipated, we ourselves are free." The third ground was that a self-governing and contented India would be the cement of the British Empire. The man-power of India would be available for the defence of the Empire against powerful enemies.

While moving the resolution on self-Government in 1916, Surendranath Banerjea observed: "Political inferiority involves moral degradation....A nation of slaves would never have produced a Patanjali, a Buddha, or a Valmiki. We want self-government in order that we might wipe off from us the badge of political inferiority and lift our heads among the nations of the earth and fulfil the great destinies that are in store for us under the blessing of Divine Providence. We want self-government not only in our own interests but for the sake of humanity at large. In the morning of the world on the banks of the Ganges and on the banks of the Jumna, the Vedic Rishis sang those hymns which represent the first yawnings of infant humanity towards the Divine ideal....we were the spiritual preceptors of mankind....Our past takes us back to the dim twilight of history. In those days when the world was sunk into barbarism we were the guides and instructors of mankind. Has our mission been fulfilled now? It has been frustrated but not fulfilled. It has to be fulfilled. It must be fulfilled, so that Europe may be rescued from the gross materialism, from the degraded culture which at the present moment have heaped the battlefields of Europe with hecatombs of dead. It is our mission to become once again the spiritual guides of mankind, but we cannot fulfil that mission unless and until we ourselves are emancipated, we ourselves are free. That is the first indispensable equipment for the discharge of that great mission."

Surendranath Banerjea was a great admirer of the past glory of India. He put emphasis on the contributions of Valmiki, Vyasa, Buddha, Panini, Patanjali and Sankara. He believed that India was the cradle of religions and the holy land of the East. He wanted the youngmen of the country to read the glories and achievements of the past in order to inspire themselves for building a glorious India of today. To quote Surendranath Banerjea, "Let us sit at the feet of our ancestors and hold communion with the master-minds of ancient India. Such communion is pleasing in these days of gubernatorial repression, in these days of political lifelessness and political stagnation, and when the future outlook is indeed so truly gloomy.....In studying the past history of your country, you will find much that is antiquated, much that is obsolete, much perhaps, that will excite ridicule and laughter. But let not any such feeling overcome you. Approach reverentially the scared records of your sires. Remember, that you are studying the sayings and doings of your revered ancestors, of

those for whose sake alone you are now remembered, for whose sake alone the intellecutal elite of Europe even now feel a deep and ardent interest in your welfare. If you cannot attain the intellectual eminence of your ancestors, why not strive to emulate their moral grandeur. The road to moral greatness is not so steep, or so slippery....Upon the moral regeneration of your country depends its intellectual, its social, and its political regeneration."

A Moderate

Surendranath Banerjea belonged to the Moderate school of thought in the Congress. He had imbibed the liberal teachings of the political philosophers of England. While in England, he had studied very carefully the writings of Herbert Spencer, J. S. Mill, Macaulay and Burke. He admired the constitutionalism and romanticism of Burke. He called him "A Heaven-appointed Conservative—one made so by the Hand of Nature." Surendranath Banerjea felt that the great lesson of constitutional history of England was the concept of freedom. He had great admiration for British politics of moderation and constitutionalism.

British Connection

Surendranath Banerjea stood for the broadening of the basis of the British Government in India and not complete independence of the country. His view was that the English civilisation was "the noblest which the world had ever seen." It was the emblem of a union between England and India. He was proud of the fact that the Indians were the citizens of a great and free empire. He held the view that the rights of the Englishmen were our rights, their privileges our privileges and their Constitution as our own Constitution. He believed that India would in fulness of time find its place in the great confederacy of the free states, English in their origin, English in their character and English in the institutions. To quote Surendranath Banerjea: "Let us work....with unwavernig loyalty to the British connection.... Then will the Congress have fulfilled its mission—justified the hopes of those who founded it; one who worked for it not by the supersession of British rule in India, but by broadening its basis, liberalizing its spirit, ennobling its character, and placing it upon the unchangeable foundations of a nation's affections. It is not severance that we look forward to—but unification, permanent embodiment, as an integral part of that great Empire which has given the rest of the world the models of free institutions....covered the world with free states. Places, hitherto the chosen abode of barbarism are now the home of freedom. Wherever floats the flag of England, there free Governments have been established. We appeal to England gradually to change the character of her rule in India, to liberalise it, to shift its foundations, to adapt it to the newly-developed environments of the country and the people, so that, in the fulness of time, India may find its place in the great confederacy of free states, English in their institutions rejoicing in their permanent and indissoluble union with England, a glory to the mother-country, and an honour to the human race. Then will England have fulfilled her great mission in the East, accomplished her high destiny among nations, repaid the long standing debt which the West owes to the East, and cover herself with imperishable renown and everlasting glory." Again, "To England we look for guidance.

To England we look for sympathy in the struggle. From England must come the crowning mandate which will enfranchise our peoples. England is our political guide and our moral preceptor in the exalted sphere of political duty. English history has taught those principles of freedom which we cherish with our life-blood. We have been fed upon the strong food of English constitutional freedom."

British Pledges to India

Surendranath Banerjea relied upon the solemn pledges given by the British Government to the people of India from time to time and Queen's Proclamation of 1858 was one of them. To quote him, "The Proclamation is the Magna Carta of our rights and liberties. The Proclamation, the whole Proclamation and nothing but the Proclamation is our watchword, our battlecry and the ensign of victory. It is the gospel of our political redemption."

Surendranath Banerjea stood for "wider employment of Indians in higher offices in the public service and the establishment of representative institutions." He pointed out that "they lay at the root of all other Indian problems. If power were vested in us to legislate and to control the finances and to carry on the administration through and by our men, in accordance with the principles laid down by our representatives, we should have self-Government in the true sense." That could be accomplished by the goodwill and cooperation of the British people.

Against Non-Cooperation

Surendranath Banerjea was opposed to the policy of non-cooperation. He pointed out that the non-cooperating masses were consumed with hatred of the alien Government and its officials. When a sentiment is firmly rooted in the public mind, it grows and expands. From a hatred of the alien Government and its officials, it is extended to political and religious opponents and other castes and creeds. Surendranath Baerjea quoted Mahatma Gandhi as having said that "they were non-cooperating among themselves by carrying on a programme of hatred and violence among themselves" and added, "It is this sentiment of hatred fostered among the masses, directed in the first instance against the British Government, that came by a natural process of growth, to be extended to all others who worshipped in a different temple, culminated in those communal and caste feuds that have darkened our recent history."

SUGGESTED READINGS

Banerjea, S.N. : *A Nation in the Making. Being the Reminiscences of Fifty Years of Public Life*, London, 1925.

Banerjea, S.N. : *Speeches and Writings* (Madras)

CHAPTER XI

Mahadev Govind Ranade (1842-1901)

In the words of G. V. Joshi, Ranade was undoubtedly one of the greatest and most representative Indians of his time. He was a distinguished scholar, a profound thinker and a philosophical writer. As a leader of thought, he had perhaps no equal. He served the Government in various capacities for many years and ultimately became a Judge of the High Court of Bombay but it was as a reformer and a leader of reformers that he held a commanding position in the public life of his country. It was his reform work which must constitute his chief title to the gratitude and veneration of his countrymen. In this field of effort, he occupied the foremost place and enjoyed undisputed pre-eminence and India had no greater worker, no abler or zealous champion of her cause. His splendid talents, his unrivalled attainments, his learning, his scholarship, his balance of mind, his clear judgement, his capacity for comprehensive views, his indomitable energy and his indefatigable industry marked him out as a leader of men. His high character, his absolute honesty of purpose, his boundless patriotism, his lofty ideals, his moderation, his patience and his exalted sense of duty inspired confidence and won for him the enthusiastic attachment and devotion of his fellow-workers and followers. For full 30 years and more, he was in the very forefront of our national life. There was hardly a reform movement in the country or even a forward effort with which he did not associate himself or which he did not in some way actively promote.

Ranade was born on 18 January 1842 at Nasik in a Chitpavan Brahman family and he died on 16 January 1901 at Bombay. He was a student of the Elphinstone College and was the first Master of Arts of the Bombay University. He got his M. A. degree in history in 1865 and LL.B. in 1866. He was so brilliant that some of his answers to the University questions were sent by Sir Alexander Grant to the University of Edinburgh. He was chosen the first Indian Fellow of the Bombay University. He joined Government service and worked as Magistrate, Small Causes Court Judge, Sub-Judge and a Judge of the High Court of Bombay. In November 1871, he went to Poona as First Class, Grade Subordinate Judge and he made a name for himself as a Judge on account of his honesty, hard work and integrity. In 1881, he was appointed Presidency Magistrate of Bombay. In 1885, he was appointed Law Member of the Bombay Legislative Council. He was Law Member again in 1890 and 1893. When Justice K. T. Telang died, Ranade was appointed a Judge of the High Court of Bombay and he continued to occupy that position till he died in harness on 16 January 1901.

The one peculiar thing that strikes about Ranade is that although he was throughout in Government service, he was able to play an important part in the political, social, economic and cultural life of the country. He was one of the founders of the Indian National Congress and he took part

in its deliberations year after year even when he was a sitting Judge of the High Court. He was interested in politics, education, history, economics and social reform. He was a great historian and an economist. Being himself great, by his influence and example, he inspired others to follow him in his footsteps.

His Attitude Towards Britain

Although Ranade was conscious of the many defects in the attitudes, policies and actions of Englishmen, he was a loyal upholder of the British connection. He found in it a great moral purpose. He saw in it the coping stone of the long disciplining process referring to it as the "discipline afforded by the example and teachings of the most gifted and free nation in the world whose rule guarantees to us a long continuance of these favourable conditions." He believed that Britain had been entrusted by God with a great mission in India. He once wrote, "The whole rationale of British rule in India is its capacity and its Providential purpose of fostering the political education of the country on the largest scale in the civil and public activities."

Ranade pointed out how "both Hindus and Mohammedans lack many of these virtues represented by the love of order and regulated authority. Both are wanting in the love of Municipal freedom, in the exercise of virtues necessary for civic life and in aptitudes for mechanical skill, in the love of science and research, in the love and daring of adventurous discovery, the resolution to master difficulties, and in chivalrous respect for womenkind. Neither the old Hindu nor the old Mohammedan civilization was in a condition to train these virtues in a way to bring up the races of India on a level with those of Western Europe, and so the work of education had to be renewed, and it has now been going on for the past century and more under the Pax Britanica with results which all of us are witnesses to in ourselves." Even when there was a bitter controversy, Ranade maintained that the good sense and justice of the British character would acknowledge the rightness of India's claims. To quote Ranade, "With a liberated manhood, with buoyant hope, with a faith that never shirks duty, with a sense of justice that deals fairly to all, with unclouded intellect and powers fully cultivated, and lastly with a love that overleaps all bounds, renovated India will take her proper rank among the nations of the world and be the master of the situation and of her own destiny. This is the goal to be reached—this is the promised land. Happy are they who see it in distant vision; happier those who are permitted to work and clear the way on to it; happiest they who live to see it with their eyes and tread upon the holy soil once more."

There is no ground for saying that Ranade wanted India for ever to be chained to the British yoke. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar is of the definite view that this charge is false and without foundation. After referring to the address of Ranade at the Social Conference held at Lucknow in 1899 on which this charge is based, Dr. Ambedkar says that far from casting any reflection upon his self-respect, the whole address testifies to his wisdom and sagacity. To quote Dr. Ambedkar. "The first thing he wanted to convey was that the conquest of India by Britain has given India the time, the opportunity and the necessary shelter for rebuilding, renovating and repairing her economic and social structure, to refit herself for bearing the strain of any foreign aggression when she does become free. The second thing Ranade wanted to

convey was that India's going out of the British Empire before she had soldified herself into a single nation, unified in thought, in feeling and charged with a sense of a common destiny, was to invite chaos and disruption in the name of independence."

Nature and Functions of the State

Ranade belied in the organic unity of the state. In his Presidential address to the First Bombay Provincial Social Conference held at Satara in May 1900, Ranade observed: "Whether in the political or social or religious or commercial or manufacturing or aesthetical spheres, in literature, in science, in art, in war, in peace, it is the individual and collective man who has to develop his powers by his own exertions in conquering the difficulties in his way. If he is down for the time, he has to get up with the whole of his strength, physical, moral and intellectual and you may as well suppose that he can develop one of those elements of strength and neglect the others, or try to separate the light from heat of the sun or the beauty and fragrance from the rose. You cannot have a good social system when you find yourself low in the scale of political rights, nor can you be fit to exercise political rights and privileges unless your social system is based on reason and justice. You cannot have a good economical system when your social arrangements are imperfect. If your religious ideals are low and grovelling, you cannot succeed in social, economical or political spheres. This inter-dependence is not an accident but is the law of our nature. Like the members of our body, you cannot have strength in the hands and the feet if your internal organs are in disorder; what applies to the human body holds good of the collective humanity we call the society or state. It is a mistaken view which divorces considerations political from social and economical, and no man can be said to realise his duty in one aspect who neglects his duties in the other directioss."

Ranade believed in the organic unity of the state. In his Presidential addisinterested wisdom of the times, working to give effect to the other tendencies, concentrating and popularizing them." Again, "The state in its collective capacity represents the power, wisdom, the mercy and charity of its best citizens." It appears that Ranade was influenced by the idealist school of thought of Germany. However, he was basically an individualist. He had faith in individual initiative and individual responsibility. He had nothing against private property and freedom of contract. He regarded the state merely as a means to further the well-being of man. The state was not the end but only a means. Ranade was not a doctrinaire individualist. His individual was an individual in society. To quote him, "Modern thought is veering to the conclusion that the individual and his interests are not the centre round which the theory should revolve, that the true centre is the body politic of which that individual is a member, and that collective defence and well-being, social education and discipline and the duties, and not merely the interests of man, must be taken into account if the theory is not to be merely Utopian."

According to Ranade, the purpose of the state is to make "individual members composing it nobler, happier, richer and more perfect in every attribute with which we are endowed." Ranade was convinced that "this perfection of our being can never be insured by any outside arrangement,

however excellent, unless the individual member concerned is in himself prepared in his own private social sphere of duties to cooperate in his own well-being." Again, "State help is after all a subordinate factor in the problem. Our own exertion and our resolutions must conquer the difficulties which are chiefly of our own creation." The end which Ranade set before himself was "to renovate, to purify and also to perfect the whole man by liberating his intellect, elevating his standard of duty and perfecting all his powers."

Ranade did not believe in the individualism of the nineteenth century but of the twentieth century. He may not be considered as the father of the idea of a welfare state, but it cannot be denied that he was one of the earliest thinkers who saw the increasing role of the state in society. In 1892, he observed, "The State is now more and more recognised as the national organ for taking care of national needs in all matters in which individual and cooperative efforts are not likely to be so effective and economical as national effort. This is the correct view to take of the pure functions of a state. To relegate them to the simple duty of maintaining peace and order is really to deprive the community of many of the advantages of the social union."

Ranade did not believe in merely the police functions of the state. He was opposed to the policy of **Laissez faire** and state indifference towards the problems of the country. He wanted the state to play an active role both in the economic and social fields. If in any matter private initiative in industrial enterprise was not forthcoming, Ranade recommended the adoption of the mercantile system. The Government should do what it had done in the case of the construction of railways in India. If the Government was not prepared to assume the functions of an industrialist, it could at least "encourage the growth of new industries by guaranteeing or subsidizing such enterprises in their pioneering stage." The Government was to advance loans to private capitalists at low interests and help them in the choice of places and the form of investment. The Government should also help by affording facilities for emigration and immigration and establishing technical institutes. He advocated the distribution of produce among the needy many and the powerful few in the spirit of equity and fairplay. The state should provide the minimum means of betterment within the scope of its resources. He supported factory legislation in India. He advocated the settlement of land revenue on a permanent basis and the supply of credit to agriculturists by the Government. To quote him, "Let the state interfere not merely with a minimum piecemeal dose of judicial reforms but by the wholesale dispensation of a large administrative relief. If it subsidizes or guarantees private banks against risks during the first few experimental years and enables them to rid the peasantry of their ancestral debts and if at the same time it allows the land revenue to be redeemed or permanently settled at a moderate figure once for all, it will provide an ample fund for agricultural improvement without the necessity of borrowing a single rupee of fresh loans."

Individual Liberty

Although Ranade believed in the organic unity of the state, he was basically an individualist. He had implicit faith in individualism. He aimed at renovating and purifying and perfecting the man by liberating his

intellect, elevating his standard of duty and perfecting all his powers. However, his individualism was the individualism of the twentieth century and not of the nineteenth century. His individual was an "indivdiual in society" who did not enjoy unlimited liberty. He was not to be hostile to the state which aimed at making him "nobler, happier, richer and more perfect." However, help from state was a secondary factor and the individual must do his best to improve himself. To quote Ranade, "This perfection of our being can never be insured by any outside arrangement, however excellent, unless the individual member concerned is in himself prepared in his own private social sphere of duties to cooperate in his own well-being."

Faith in India's Future

Ranade frankly recognised the weaknesses of his countrymen. He deplored the lack of unity and inability to work harmoniously together for common ends among the Indians. He deplored the lack of enterprise and perseverance and the tendency to be easily elated and too easily depressed. His view was that the Indians were too prone to shout catchwords of which they did not really understand the significance. There was also a tendency to attach too much importance to the past and praise extravagantly and without proportion the days of old. He saw the danger of such an attitude as that was likely to deaden the mind to present duty. He asked the people to understand the need of hard work in place of merely praising their past. To quote him, " We should learn to be men, stalwart and puritan men, battling for the right, not indifferent nor sanguine, trustful but not elated, serious but not dejected. This is the change in the character that has to be accomplished." However, Ranade envisaged a bright future for his country. In 1896, he declared, "With a liberated manhood, with buoyant hope, with a faith that never shirks duty, with a sense of justice that deals fairly to all with unclouded intelligence and powers fully cultivated and lastly, with a love that overleaps all bounds, renovated India will take her proper rank among the nations of the world and be the master of the situation and of her own destiny. Happy are they who see it in distant vision; happier those who are permitted to work and clear the way on to it; happiest they who live to see it with their eyes and tread upon the holy soil once more." Again, "This country of ours is the true land of promise. This race of ours is a chosen race."

Social Reform

Ranade was a champion of social reform. He believed that political and social reform must go together and hence he took keen interest in social matters also. He was an active member of the Prarthana Samaj which propagated inter-dining, interlmarriage and re-marriage of widofs. It started a home for the widows and a Depressed Classes Mission. Ranade took keen interest in its activities. He became a member of the Widow Marriage Association which was set up is 1866 and advocated the cause of widow re-marriage. He declared, "The advocates of remarriage have never maintained that a woman after her husband's death should not live a life of single devotion to her deceased husband. They fairly allow that such heroic self-sacrifice to a sentiment is peculiarly meritorious. But a woman who cannot lead this sort of life, a woman who is widowed when a girl before she knew who her husband was, before she knew what her duties as wife were—surely such a woman cannot practise such a devotion."

Ranade was opposed to the subjection of women and the consequential weaknesses generated in the social system. He was highly critical of the evil consequences of the social evils in Indian society. He is said to have observed thus in 1897 : "Now what have been inward forms or ideas which have been hastening our decline during the past 3000 years ? These ideas may be briefly set forth as isolation, submission to outward force or power more than to the voice of the inward conscience, perception of fictitious differences between men and women due to heredity and birth, passive acquiescence in evil or wrong doing and a general indifference to secular well-being almost bordering upon fatalism. These have been the root ideas of our ancient social system. They have as their natural result led to the existing family arrangements where woman is entirely subordinated to man and the lower caste to higher caste, to the length of depriving men of their natural respect for humanity.

When Swami Dayanand went to Poona for propagating social and religious reforms, Ranade who was posted at Poona at that time, gave him full support. He also supported Malabari (1853-1912) in his efforts to get a law passed laying down the minimum age after which girls might be married. When the Indian National Congress was founded in 1885, the leaders felt that the national movement should not be exclusively political, but side by side with political questions, matters relating to social reform of the country should also be considered. In accordance with that view, Raghunath Rao and Ranade gave addresses on social reform at the first meeting of the Indian National Congress. As the Indian National Congress decided that social matters should not be a part of its function, it was decided to start a separate movement called the Indian National Social Conference and the first Social Conference was held at Madras in December 1887. The meetings of the Social Conference were held at the same time and at the same place where the session of the Congress was held. The object of the Social Conference was to stimulate and strengthen the forces of reform by bringing together every year in mutual consultation representatives of the various associations and movements which scattered all over India were struggling with the social evils prevalent in India. The Social Conference discussed matters relating to the disabilities attendant on distant sea voyages, the ruinous expenses on marriage, the limitation of age below which marriages should not take place, the remarriage of youthful widows, the evils of the marriages of young girls with old men and the forms and evidences of marriages and inter-marriages between sub-divisions of the same caste, should receive special attention. The unifying of the social movement in India was an achievement of great importance. Raghunath Rao was the Secretary but Ranade was the guiding hand and the inspiring mind. Every year when the Social Conference met, Ranade gave an address in which he summarised the reports that had come to him from the Social Reforms Associations all over India.

The view of Ranade was that Indians were as national socially as they were politically. He admitted that there were great differences of opinion on the question of immediate and practical reform, but there was a background of common tradition, common religion, common laws, institutions and customs which made it possible for all to deliberate together in spite of differences. It was the duty of the social reformers to eliminate differences and correct the perversions which had sprung up and obscured the

nobility of their common stock and origin. The social evils from which India was suffering, did not exist in the past and while seeking their reforms, Indians were not imitating any foreign models but restoring their ancient freedom and dignity in place of present corruption.

The view of Ranade was that both the Hindus and the Muslims had to make common efforts in the struggle for social regeneration. To quote him, "In the backwardness of female education, in the disposition to overleap the bounds of their own religion, in matters of temperance, in their internal dissensions between castes and creeds, in the indulgence of impure speech, thought and action on occasions when they are disposed to enjoy themselves, in the abuses of many customs in regard to unequal and polygamous marriages, in the desire to be extravagant in their expenditure on such occasions, in the neglect of regulated charity, in the decay of public spirit and in insisting on the proper management of endowments—in these and other matters both communities are equal sinners and there is thus much ground for improvement on common lines."

Ranade recognised the fact that "You are unconsciously influenced by the traditions in which you are born, by the surroundings in which you are brought up, by the very milk you have drunk from your mother's breast or influenced by these things in the world which you cannot disown." "To say that it is possible to build up a new fabric on new lines without any help from the past is to say that I am self-born and my father and grandfather need not have troubled for me. That is the way in which things strike me at least."

However, this does not mean that Ranade wanted to live in the past. He was a staunch opponent of revivalism preached in the name of a Golden Age in the past. He is said to have asked, "What shall we revive? Shall we revive the twelve forms of sons, or eight forms of marriages which included capture and recognise mixed and illegitimate intercourse? Shall we revive the Niyoga system of procreating sons on our brother's wives when widowed? Shall we revive the old liberties taken by the Rishis and the wives of Rishis with marital tie?" His view was that society was a living organisation and no revival was possible. The dead were buried and burnt once for all and the dead past could not be revived except by a reformation of the old materials into new organised beings. If revival was impossible, reformation was the only alternative open to sensible people.

Ranade spoke of four methods advocated by social reformers viz., the traditional method, the conscience method, the legislative method and the method of rebellion. He was in favour of the first three methods but was opposed to the fourth method. The traditional method aimed at convincing the people that the desired change was sanctioned by the old scriptures like the Vedas and the Smritis. This method was used by Swami Dayanand and R. G. Bhandarkar. Ranade himself applied this method while advocating the remarriage of widows. To quote him, "There is thus express permission in the Vedas, express permission in the Smriti law common to all Yugas and express permission in the special law for the Kaliyuga and it has been shown that all the prohibitory texts are mostly vague and general and so far from abrogating only restrict the number of contingencies when remarriage is permitted by law." Ranade pointed out that the Smritis restricted twelve years as the minimum age for marriage for girls and eighteen for

boys. The consummation of marriage was not allowed till the girl attained the age of 18 and the boy 25.

The method of conscience made a direct appeal to the conscience of the people. "The conscience is the voice of God within us. Unless the conscience is aroused, nothing can be achieved. It is not easy to arouse the conscience of a nation but there are indications that the dead bones are pulsating with a new life and that the cold limbs are reviving with a warmth hitherto despaired of."

The third method was that of enforcing reforms by means of penalties imposed either by the caste or the state. Ranade was in favour of caste organisations being utilised for the purpose of reforms. To persuade the religious heads of different sects to bless the cause of social reform and to see to it that they were animated by a high purpose and inspired the country and purified the people was another method supported by Ranade. It was hoped that if the religious heads backed the reform movement, popular opposition would melt away.

Ranade looked to legislation for social reform when the other methods failed and suggested legislation on the following matters :—

(1) Minimum age for the marriage of both boys and girls, 16 to 18 years for boys and 10 to 12 for girls.

(2) Before the solemnization of marriage, the parties should get licences from municipal and district boards.

(3) Universities should confine their honours and distinctions to those who remained unmarried during their stay at the college.

(4) Men above the age of 45 should not be allowed to marry virgin girls.

(5) A second marriage during the life-time of the first wife should be permitted only under certain conditions laid down in the Sastras.

(6) Sexual intercourse with a wife below 14 years of age should be punishable as rape.

Prof. W. B. Patwardhan writes about Ranade, "For twenty or thirty years, he was practically the life-breath of the reform movement. He organised the movement, focussed the various forms and spasmodic activities of individual reformers; he shaped it anew and reconciling it with the past soldered it with all that was noble and precious in our heritage. He established a continuity where all seemed to be broken up and confused. Licence was over and its place was taken by chastened liberty. Revolution yielded place to evolution. Disruption ceased and a process of slow organic growth set in. He secured the help and well-being of the spirit of reform and was content to let alone the form it manifested itself in."

In an Essay entitled "State Legislation in Social Matters" written towards the end of the nineteenth century, Ranade advocated to some extent the help of state regulation. To the question whether it was duty of the state to regulate social questions, the repay of Ranade was : "The state in its collective capaci'y represents the power, the wisdom, the mercy and charity of its best citizens. What a single man or a combination of men can best do on their own account, that the state may not do, but it cannot shirk its duty if it sees its way to remedy evils which no private combination of men can check adequately or which it can deal with more speedily

and effectively than any private combination of men can do. In these latter cases, the state's regulating action has its sphere of duty marked out clearly." The regulation of the age for marriage and the protection of the widow clearly come within the sphere of state action.

The question was whether the evils of child marriage, enforced widowhood and unrestricted polygamy were quantitatively so great that the state must take action. Ranade felt that enthusiasts like Malabari had perhaps over-stated their case, but the residue of unredressed wrongs which called for remedy was sufficiently great to justify state action. To quote him, "Wherever there is undeserved misery endured in a large number of cases, there is a ground for state interference, always supposing that the interference will lead to the redress of the wrong better than any individual effort can accomplish."

Ranade did not agree with the view that the state should not interfere when the victims of social evils and injustice like infant brides and widows did not themselves complain. Widows and children were not the proper persons who could seek their own relief under the wrong that was done to them and to society. Moreover, the argument that those who suffered did not complain, would not stand because the worst effect of injustice is that it depresses the downtrodden victims to such an extent that they lick the hand of the oppressor. Ranade pointed out that the slaves fought on the side of the Southern planters against their Northern liberators during the Civil War in the United States in the 1860's.

The view of Ranade was that the argument of Tilak that the assistance of a foreign Government should not be sought to solve social problems "has a meaning and significance when foreign interests over-ride native interests, but when the foreigners have no interests to serve and the initiative to be all our own, the recognition of state help is not open to the stock objection urged by those who think that we forfeit our independence by seeking such regulation on lines approved by us." If the foreign rulers consolidated their selfish interests only, they would rather let the natives remain as they were, disorganised and demoralised, stunted and deformed "with the curse and folly and wickedness paralysing all the healthy activities and vital energies of our social body." Ranade's view was that from the theoretical point of view, the objection was valid only when the initiative for social reform was not taken by the dependent people themselves. However, when the initiative came from them and all that was sought at the hands of the foreigners was to give to the enlightened view of the community the force and sanction of law, no valid objection could be taken. Moreover, if the objection was accepted that the cooperation of a foreign Government should not be taken to change social customs, it would follow that so long as alien rule lasted, social customs harmful to certain sections of society should be allowed to continue. The view of Ranade was that such legislation would not constitute an imposition by alien rulers on Hindu society but in fact would reinstate the ancient social regulations which had disappeared because of "the pre-dominance of barbarous influences and by the intolerance of ruthless conquerors."

Ranade referred to the view of Sir Henry Maine that all progress in social liberation tends to be a change from the law of status to the law of contract, from the restraints of family and caste customs to the self-imposed

restraints of the free will of the individual. "The liberation from superstitious thraldom which will result from the changes proposed, is not likely to be the least of its benefits."

Ranade was nearest to Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Sir Syed Ahmad Khan among the reformers as regards largeness of his vision and magnanimity of his character, but he was more advanced than either of them in the width of his constructive aim, his grasp of the principles underlying Western civilization and his application of those principles to the conditions in India. His view was that religion was inseparable from social reform as love to men is inseparable from love to God. Life could not be shut up into water-tight compartments. Religion must bring about unity in all spheres of human activity. His reforming faith was comprehensive. His social programme led to higher national aims.

From a study of his published works, we can discover certain principles which directed all his thoughts. One principle was that he had a profound and unshaken faith in an over-ruling Providence guiding his country and his race. To quote him, "We represent in India a continuity of creed, traditions, literature, philosophy, modes of life and forms of thought which are peculiar to this land. It cannot, surely, be for nothing that this peculiar favour has been shown to us under Providential guidance. If the miraculous preservation of a few thousand Jews had a purpose, this more miraculous preservation of one-fifth of the human race is not due to mere chance. We are under the severe discipline of a high purpose. Change for the better by slow and gradual absorption, assimilation, not by sudden conversion and revolution—this has been the characteristic feature of our past history." Another principle was that the social organism in a country such as India containing many millions of the human race, has a life, a growth of its own which cannot be ruthlessly thrown aside. To quote Ranade, "The process of growth is always slow, where it has to be a sure growth. There are those among us who think that the work of the reformer is confined only to a brave resolve to break with the past and do what his own individual reason suggests as proper and fitting. The power of long-formed habits and tendencies is ignored in this view of the matter. The true reformer has not to write on a clean slate. His work is more often to complete the half-written sentence."

Ranade gave his great message to the social reformers in these words: "Strength of numbers we cannot command, but we can command earnestness of conviction, singleness of devotion, readiness for self-sacrifice, in all honest workers in the cause. In the words of the Prophet of Nazareth, 'we have to take up our cross and not because it is pleasant to be prosecuted but because the pain and injury are nothing by the side of the priniciple for which they are endured.'" Justice N.G. Chandavarkar writes about Ranade, "There were social reformers before him, but they were more or less content each to plough his own field along his own particular furrow, without much thought or knowledge, of what the others were doing. One man preached a crusade against caste in one part of the country, another advocated the remarriage of young widows in another, a third strove to disseminate the light of education among women in a third. There was no touch, no sympathy, not even the knowledge of the fact that they were fellow workers, among the early reformers. He did or tried his best to

and effectively than any private combination of men can do. In these latter cases, the state's regulating action has its sphere of duty marked out clearly." The regulation of the age for marriage and the protection of the widow clearly come within the sphere of state action.

The question was whether the evils of child marriage, enforced widowhood and unrestricted polygamy were quantitatively so great that the state must take action. Ranade felt that enthusiasts like Malabari had perhaps over-stated their case, but the residue of unredressed wrongs which called for remedy was sufficiently great to justify state action. To quote him, "Wherever there is undeserved misery endured in a large number of cases, there is a ground for state interference, always supposing that the interference will lead to the redress of the wrong better than any individual effort can accomplish."

Ranade did not agree with the view that the state should not interfere when the victims of social evils and injustice like infant brides and widows did not themselves complain. Widows and children were not the proper persons who could seek their own relief under the wrong that was done to them and to society. Moreover, the argument that those who suffered did not complain, would not stand because the worst effect of injustice is that it depresses the downtrodden victims to such an extent that they lick the hand of the oppressor. Ranade pointed out that the slaves fought on the side of the Southern planters against their Northern liberators during the Civil War in the United States in the 1860's.

The view of Ranade was that the argument of Tilak that the assistance of a foreign Government should not be sought to solve social problems "has a meaning and significance when foreign interests over-ride native interests, but when the foreigners have no interests to serve and the initiative to be all our own, the recognition of state help is not open to the stock objection urged by those who think that we forfeit our independence by seeking such regulation on lines approved by us." If the foreign rulers consolidated their selfish interests only, they would rather let the natives remain as they were, disorganised and demoralised, stunted and deformed "with the curse and folly and wickedness paralysing all the healthy activities and vital energies of our social body." Ranade's view was that from the theoretical point of view, the objection was valid only when the initiative for social reform was not taken by the dependent people themselves. However, when the initiative came from them and all that was sought at the hands of the foreigners was to give to the enlightened view of the community the force and sanction of law, no valid objection could be taken. Moreover, if the objection was accepted that the cooperation of a foreign Government should not be taken to change social customs, it would follow that so long as alien rule lasted, social customs harmful to certain sections of society should be allowed to continue. The view of Ranade was that such legislation would not constitute an imposition by alien rulers on Hindu society but in fact would reinstate the ancient social regulations which had disappeared because of "the pre-dominance of barbarous influences and by the intolerance of ruthless conquerors."

Ranade referred to the view of Sir Henry Maine that all progress in social liberation tends to be a change from the law of status to the law of contract, from the restraints of family and caste customs to the self-imposed

restraints of the free will of the individual. "The liberation from superstitious thraldom which will result from the changes proposed, is not likely to be the least of its benefits."

Ranade was nearest to Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Sir Syed Ahmad Khan among the reformers as regards largeness of his vision and magnanimity of his character, but he was more advanced than either of them in the width of his constructive aim, his grasp of the principles underlying Western civilization and his application of those principles to the conditions in India. His view was that religion was inseparable from social reform as love to men is inseparable from love to God. Life could not be shut up into water-tight compartments. Religion must bring about unity in all spheres of human activity. His reforming faith was comprehensive. His social programme led to higher national aims.

From a study of his published works, we can discover certain principles which directed all his thoughts. One principle was that he had a profound and unshaken faith in an over-ruling Providence guiding his country and his race. To quote him, "We represent in India a continuity of creed, traditions, literature, philosophy, modes of life and forms of thought which are peculiar to this land. It cannot, surely, be for nothing that this peculiar favour has been shown to us under Providential guidance. If the miraculous preservation of a few thousand Jews had a purpose, this more miraculous preservation of one-fifth of the human race is not due to mere chance. We are under the severe discipline of a high purpose. Change for the better by slow and gradual absorption, assimilation, not by sudden conversion and revolution—this has been the characteristic feature of our past history." Another principle was that the social organism in a country such as India containing many millions of the human race, has a life, a growth of its own which cannot be ruthlessly thrown aside. To quote Ranade, "The process of growth is always slow, where it has to be a sure growth. There are those among us who think that the work of the reformer is confined only to a brave resolve to break with the past and do what his own individual reason suggests as proper and fitting. The power of long-formed habits and tendencies is ignored in this view of the matter. The true reformer has not to write on a clean slate. His work is more often to complete the half-written sentence."

Ranade gave his great message to the social reformers in these words: "Strength of numbers we cannot command, but we can command earnestness of conviction, singleness of devotion, readiness for self-sacrifice, in all honest workers in the cause. In the words of the Prophet of Nazareth, 'we have to take up our cross and not because it is pleasant to be prosecuted but because the pain and injury are nothing by the side of the priniciple for which they are endured.'" Justice N.G. Chandavarkar writes about Ranade, "There were social reformers before him, but they were more or less content each to plough his own field along his own particular furrow, without much thought or knowledge, of what the others were doing. One man preached a crusade against caste in one part of the country, another advocated the remarriage of young widows in another, a third strove to disseminate the light of education among women in a third. There was no touch, no sympathy, not even the knowledge of the fact that they were fellow workers, among the early reformers. He did or tried his best to

weed his little field of the shrubs and trees that had grown upon in it unawares during the night of ages, and when his time came laid down his head and died where he had worked not knowing whether there would be a harvest and whether anybody would be forthcoming to reap it up if there were one. Differences of subjects, differences of castes, differences of provinces and districts, differences of language separated the workers from one another."

Ranade was a worker in every field of progress. He was interested not only in political reform but also in social and economic reform. He was a statesman and not a mere politician. He always took a long range view of things. He was convinced that the lasting re-generation of India could take place only if the internal obstacles were removed. Although he himself was intensely religious, his view was that too much pre-occupation with religious matters to the exclusion of secular matters, was a great evil. The Indians also lacked the spirit of cooperation and unless this defect was removed, there could be no success in the political field. India had been defeated on many occasions in the past on account of the absence of the spirit of national cohesion. Prof. Karve writes, "We had to conquer these before we set out to conquer our external conquerors. Fortunately the conquest over self-imposed obstacles was possible without outside sympathy or assistance. The inculcation of these three virtues—public spirit, national cohesion and political discipline—was for Ranade the very first step in a systematic reconstruction of the Indian polity. It was for the inculcation of these virtues that Ranade had applied himself to the eradication of these social evils which for centuries had been undermining the very basis of Indian life, social as well as political."

Economic Ideas of Ranade

In the words of P. K. Gopalakrishnan, "Mahadeo Govind Ranade was the first economist who laid down the conditions of economic progress for India and showed a whole range of possible polity to achieve this progress. The importance of Ranade was that of a very great scientific pioneer. He succeeded more than anybody else in India in isolating the chief categories of Indian economic life. He left to his successors many unsolved problems but he also indicated ways in which they might be solved. Thus not only early Indian economic thought but modern Indian economics also with its interest in problems of economic development could claim Ranade as its founder." Bhabatosh Datta writes, "It was Ranade's idea that conclusions regarding Indian economic problems and policies should be drawn with special reference to the peculiar conditions of the country and of the people. He could be ranked among the relativists in economics alongwith Roscher, Knies and Hildebrand."

Ranade was a critic of classical economists. He rejected the view of economists like Adam Smith, James Mill and Malthus that their principles and assumptions were universally and absolutely true. Those principles and assumptions were that national economy is essentially individualistic and has no separate collective aspect. The individual or the typical economic man has no desire but that of promoting his own self-interest. Self-interest is best promoted by the largest production of wealth with the least trouble. The pursuit of private gain by each individual promotes best the general good. The free and unlimited competition of individuals

in the race and struggle of life is the only safe and natural regulator. All customary and state regulation is an encroachment on natural liberty. Every individual knows best his interest and his capacity and desire of acting according to that knowledge. There is perfect freedom and equality in the power of contract between individual and individual. Capital and labour are always free and ready to move from one employment to another where better remuneration is expected. There is universal tendency of profits and wages to seek a common level. Population tends to outstrip the means of subsistence. Demand and supply always tend mutually to adjust each other.

Ranade criticised the assumptions of the classical school and pointed out how their theories did not apply to the conditions prevailing in India. To quote him, "If the law of relativity and correspondence holds good in politics and social sciences generally, it ought to hold good equally in all kindred subjects, including among others, the science of national wealth or as it is more popularly described Political Economy. The same teachers and statesmen who warn us against certain tendencies in our political aspirations, forget their salutary caution when the question at issue is one of Indian economics. They seem to hold that the truths of economic science as they have been expounded in our most popular ancient text books are absolutely and demonstrably true, and must be accepted as guides of conduct for all time and place whatever may be the stage of national advance. Ethnical, social, juristic, ethical or economic differences in the environments are not regarded as having any influence in modifying the practical application of these truths. If free trade is good for England, it must be equally beneficial in all countries, and prohibitive or protective duties, bounties and subsidies, restrictions and regulative control are absolute evils and no thought need be given to the relative differences in civilisation or the possession of natural advantages or disadvantages in matters of situation, climate, soil, natural aptitudes and wants."

Ranade was influenced by the ideas of Auguste Comte, Muller and Friedrich List. He pointed out that economy was a constantly growing process. Even if the propositions of the classical school applied to the static aspect of society to some extent, they did not reveal the trends of the dynamic aspects of economy. Ranade wrote, "It will be seen that in the land of its birth and highest development, the claims of Political Economy, as ordinarily taught in the text books, have been seriously questioned and its value as a guide to practical conduct greatly discounted."

When Ranade was expounding his economic thought, all industrially progressive countries, excluding England, were not only discarding free trade and adopting fair and protected trade but they were also embarking on a policy of direct assistance to industry and implementation of aggressive economic policy. English reaction expressed itself in favour of preserving British markets for British goods and later it developed into an Imperial Preference policy. Ranade was fully justified in laying down principles and formulating policies with the object of securing the prosperity of India's trade and industry. Agreeing a great deal with Friedrich List, Ranade urged that India's trade policy must not be considered in isolation. It must be a part of her general economic policy which would draw out her latent resources and lead to moral and material prosperity. Like List, he had

great faith in the guiding, protecting and coordinating role of the state not only in economic but also in other spheres of organised human life.

A study of the development of economic ideas in India during the last nearly 100 years shows that there emerged among economists two distinc ive view-pjoints. One was the Dadabhai Naoroji school and the other the Ranade school. The Dadabhai Naoroji school looked upon the British rule as the primary cause of India's growing backwardness. The followers of the Ranade school drew attention to the various deficiencies in India's socio-economic structure as constituting the real underlying cause of India's lack of growth. Ranade tried to extricate the economic issues from the political issues. He influenced substantially the general form and content of the Indian economic thought. State intervention was considered as the means to overcome the deficiencies in the economic institutions of India. Ranade and his school generally concentrated upon the study of the detailed aspects of various economic phenomena through the historical and the empirical methods. Each economic issue was considered in isolation. The need to evolve a general set of laws and various theories to explain or interpret the nature of the complicated inter-relationship was not sufficiently emphasized. It is to the Ranade tradition that the origin of the general bias of Indian thinkers in regard to state intervention, can be traced. The contribution of Ranade was to accentuate the need for modifying economic policy in the light of Indian institutional deficiencies.

About the economic situation in India, Ranade pointed out that the individual in India was the very antithesis of Adam Smith's concept of the economic man. The role of the individual in India was determined by the family or the caste to which he might belong. The principal motive was not self-interest or pursuit of wealth. It was also not the principal objective as an average Indian prefers to follow the traditional occupation. Customs and state regulation were far more significant than competition. Status was more important than contract in Indian society. To quote Ranade, "Neither capital nor labour is mobile and enterprising and intelligent enough to shift from place to place. Wages and profits are fixed and not elastic and responsive to change of circumstances. Population follows its own law, being cut down by disease and famine, while production is almost stationary, the bumper harvest of one year being needed to provide against the uncertainties of alternate bad seasons. In a society so constituted, the tendencies assumed as axiomatic are not only inoperative but are actually deflected from their proper direction. You might as well talk of the tendency of mountains to be washed away into the sea, or of the valley to fill up, of the sun to get cold, as reasons for our practical conduct within measurable distance of time."

Ranade was the first Indian thinker to suggest the idea of a planned economic development for the country. He explained the various steps and stages of Indian economic develpoment and came to the conclusion that India's path of development would be quite different from the path followed by the European countries.

Ranade was convinced that the policy of **Laissez faire** was not suitable for India. The police state ought to be transformed into a welfare state. He condemned the harmful influence of the theories of Bentham, Ricardo, Adam Smith and others on the economic policies of the Government of India.

For him, economic and cultural development was a legitimate function of a modern state. The activities of a modern state could not be restricted only to the maintenance of law and order. The state which permitted waste, exploitation or stagnation could not be considered civilized. Ranade became a supporter of the role of the state promoting economic development but he felt that the Government of India would not grant protective tariffs to promote industrial development in the country. Hence, he demanded state action to promote large-scale farming as a diversion from small farming, from agriculture itself to industry, from rustification to urbanization and from internal trade to foreign trade. He hoped that state intervention would expedite the process of economic growth in various spheres. To quote Ranade, "While we put forth our energies in these directions, we can well count upon the assistance of the state in regulating our cooperative efforts by helping us to form deposit and finance banks and facilitating recoveries of advances made by them, by encourating new industries with guarantees and subsidies, or loans at low interest, by pioneering the way to new enterprises and affording facilities for emigration and immigration and establishing technical institutes buying more largely the stores they require here and, in many cases, by producing their own stores." The state can also undertake to buy leather, wooden goods etc. from the Indian producer and thus secure the benefit of sure customer at remunerative rate to new undertakings. In support of his view, Ranade quoted the view of J. S. Mill that a good Government will give all its aid in such a shape as to encourage and nurture any rudiments it may find of a spirit of individual exertion. It will be assiduous in removing obstacles and discouragements to voluntary enterprise and in giving whatever facilities and whatever direction and guidance may be necessary. Its pecuniary means will be applied when practicable in aid to private efforts rather than in suppression of them and it will call into play its machinery of rewards and honours to elicit such efforts."

Ranade was convinced that protective tariffs were necessary to help the infant industries to develop into a stage of maturity but he did not expect the British to accede to his advice in that respect. It is rightly pointed out that demand for protection of Indian industries against unfair British competition was tantamount to asking the English rulers to quit India. Being a realist, Ranade admitted this fact in these words: "It is not open to us to adopt certain plans of operation which, however much they might be condemned on abstract grounds, have been followed with practical success in many of the most enlightened countries of Europe and America. We cannot, as with the Governments of these countries, rely upon differential tariffs to protect home industries during their experimental trial. We cannot expect the Government here to do what France or Germany do for their shipping trade and their sugar industry and ask Government bounties and subsidies to be paid out of general taxes. These are heresies according to English Political Economy such as is taught to us and whether be really so or not, it is useless to divert our energies in fruitless discussion and seek to achieve victory over free trade."

Ranade wanted the state to encourage production of both raw and manufactured goods. He pointed out that the Dutch Government was sponsoring the planting of commercial crops in Java with state subsidies. The railway policy of the Government of India was on the same lines. To

quote Ranade, "The Government of India when it adopted the policy of constructing the productive works out of borrowed capital did in fact affirm the principle that in the peculiarly backward condition of the country, the development of its resources could not be left to independent private enterprise and that as representing the general public, it was bound to utilise public resources of credit and its superior intelligence and organisation for the advantage of its subjects by undertaking to be the great railway and canal constructors in the country."

Ranade was realistic in his programme of industrial development. His view was that India required a balanced development of her agriculture, industry and trade. Agrarian development should be adjusted with a carefully prepared plan of large-scale industrialisation with the help of modern technology. Ranade considered industrialisation as a many-sided process involving the general cultral transformation of the people and changing their habits and outlook. He wanted a sound educational and training programme for skilled workers and adequate public health measures to increase the efficiency of the working people. The Government was asked to undertake engineering and construction work in the country through a properly planned investment of capital.

Ranade was against the production of luxury articles as their demand was not steady. Only goods of mass consumption could ensure a suitable market and adequate returns on investments. He was opposed to the diversion of industries to rural areas. It was in the national interest to develop scientific and organised industry, but agriculture could not be left out from the general scheme of modernisation. He was not in favour of the immediate introduction of machinery in agriculture on account of the unfavourable man-land ratio in India. If machination of agriculture could increase productivity, it could also create large-scale rural unemployment. Therefore, Ranade favoured the prior development of manufacturing industries to absorb surplus population of agriculture.

Textile, sugar and even steel industries were established in India but they needed state protection, and encouragement for further expansion. Industries based on oils, dyes, tobacco and leather were yet to be developed and required state help to solve their technical and organisational problems.

The view of Ranade was that Ricardo's view that rent is unearned increment does not hold good in case of India. To quote Ranade, "The unearned increment theory fits in only where landed property continues for generations in the possession of the same family. If the land changes hands, the incoming purchaser buys it at its market value and he enjoys no unearned advantage and the so-called rent is but a return by way of fair profits on his investment." In the case of England, the law of primogeniture allowed the same family to own large estates for several generations and thus allowed free play to the law of unearned increment. Another view of Ricardo that economic rent does not enter as a factor of price was also not true in case of India. Ranade pointed out that it "admittedly does not apply when occupied land has to pay monopoly rents to the State landlord. There is no competition among landlords in this country, for there is only one true landlord and the so-called land tax is not a tax on rent proper but frequently encroaches upon the profits and wages of the poor peasant." P.J. Jagirdar writes, "Ranade's criticism of the Ricardian ideas germinated in the atmosphere of high land revenue assessments. Ranade sought the reason as to

why they were felt to be high. Land-owners, large and small, felt them high because while the Government assumed that they were paying land revenue out of unearned increment and so thought that there was no harm in charging high rates, the land-owners were actually paying it on the top of the high prices they had already paid to the former owners of the land they had bought. Hence, Ranade's criticism that the unearned increment doctrine did not apply to India where landed property not infrequently changed hands. As for the poor landowners in the Ryotwari areas, the Government were assessing their revenues on the assumption that they were the tenants of the Government; Ranade saw the dangerous implications of this assumption; he said in effect, that if land revenue is rent it is monopoly rent which is higher than the rent of Ricardo's conception; and thus an explanation was found as to why the poor peasant was feeling the burden of land revenue very heavy." According to Ranade, the only solution of the problem was that the Government should withdraw from its position as monopoly landlord and consider the land tax like any other monopoly tax.

Ranade advocated economic nationalism. His view was that as India's economic interests and conditions differed from those of England, the principles of economics applicable to India must also be different. The example of his economic nationalism was his opposition to the theory of international division of labour by which industrial development was considered the prerogative of the Western nations alone and agriculture was assigned as the permanent responsibility of the oriental peoples like that of India. To quote Ranade, "The orthodox economists assign to the backward torrid zone regions of Asia the duty of producing raw materials and claim for the advanced European temperate zone countries of the work of transport and manufactures, as a division of the labour in production which is fraught with the highest advantage to all and is almost a Providential dispensation against which it would be foolish to rebel. Of course, as far as the natural advantages of climate and situation force our hands, economically backward races must submit to such an arrangement, but it is fairly open to question whether there is any such inevitable necessity which justifies a line of separation which has a tendency to accentuate natural deficiencies and make them a source of permanent weakness. Ranade gave many arguments against the theory of international division of labour. He pointed out that the past history of the torrid zone countries like India shows that their skilled products found a ready market in temperate countries and excited such envy as to dictate prohibitive measures both in ancient Rome and modern England. It is more logical to manufacture the finished goods in the same country where the raw materials grow than to transport those raw materials to distant lands and bring them back as manufacutred goods for sale and consumption. The differences in favour of temperate zones were all modern developments due to the abundance of cheap iron and coal and the use of machines. This is a temporary advantage and the torrid zone countries can also learn modern technology and import such minerals from other countries in which they are deficient. The countries which at present are not industrialised, can develop industries by using their own raw materials in course of time. They cannot do so under conditions of free trade but this can be achieved by adopting a policy of protective tariffs to support infant industries. Countries like India depending on agriculture suffer from the law of diminishing returns while the Western countries enjoy the benefit of in-

creasing returns. The result will be that the poor nations will become poorer and the rich nations will become richer.

The view of Ranade was that India's poverty was due to many causes and the chief among them was the dependence of the majority of the people of India on agriculture. He criticized the railway policy of the Government of India because railways had made competition with Europe more hopeless over large areas and facilitated the conveyance of foreign goods to an extent not otherwise possible. That policy had killed local indigenous industries and made people more helpless than ever before by increasing their dependence on agriculture as their single source. Ranade wrote in 1893, "The great Indian Dependency has come to be regarded as a plantation, the growing raw produce to be shipped by British agents in British ships, to be worked into fabrics by British skill and capital and to be re-exported to the Dependency by British merchants to their corresponding British firms in India and elsewhere."

The other causes of India's poverty were lack of capital, the wretched system of credit and the congestion of population in certain areas. Regarding lack of capital, Ranade wrote that the difficulty was not one of absolute lack of capital, but lack of proper arrangement for bringing available capital into the hands of those who need it and could use it to advantage. The credit system enabled the moneylenders to flourish at the cost of the people. As there was congestion of population in certain areas, land could not give adequate livelihood to all. His view was that the people of India lacked the spirit of enterprise and were not ambitious. Indian social life was not organised with a view to success in wealth production.

Ranade did not attribute the poverty of India to what is known as the "economic drain" of the country. To quote him, "There are some people who think that as long as we have a heavy tribute to pay to England which takes away nearly twenty crores of our surplus exports, we are doomed and can do nothing to help ourselves. This is, however, hardly a fair or manly position to take up. A portion of the burden represents interest on moneys advanced to or invested in our country and so far from complaining, we have reason to be thankful that we have a creditor who supplies our needs at such a low rate of interest. Another portion represents the value of stores supplied to us, the like of which we cannot produce here. The remainder is alleged to be more or less necessary for the purpose of administration, defence and payment of pensions and here there is some cause for complaint." For this view, Ranade was criticized in these words: "Mahadev in singing the praises of foreign capital is a traitor of his country." Ranade suggested certain remedies to remove the poverty of the people of India. In that connection, he put the greatest emphasis on the growth of Indian manufactures and commerce. To quote him, "What we have to do is to learn by organised cooperation to compete with the foreigner and take in as much raw produce from abroad as we need and work it up here and send in place of our exports of raw produce the same quantities in less bulky but more valuable forms after they have undergone the operation of art manipulation and afforded occupation to our industrial classes."

Ranade as Historian

Ranade was a great historian. He was the author of "The Rise of Maratha Power" (1900), an Essay on "Mints and Coins of the Maratha

Period" (1889) and "Introduction to the Satara Rajas and the Peshwa's Diaries" (1900). His service to the history of India and Maratha nationality lies in the fact that he established it beyond doubt that the British had to defeat the Marathas and wrest power from their hands before establishing their sway in Western and Central India and though defeated, the Marathas were quite enlightened rulers who had to succumb to a people of superior civilization. There was in their doings during a period of 150 years of their rule much that must evoke admiration. The rise of the Marathas was not "an accident due to any chance combination but was a genuine effort on the part of a Hindu nationality, not merely to assert its independence, but to achieve what had not been attempted before—the formation of a confederacy of states, animated by a common patriotism and that the success it achieved was due to a general upheaval—social, religious, political—of all classes of the population."

Ranade pointed out that "the immediate predecessors of the British rulers of India were not the Mohammedans, as is too often taken for granted, but they were the native rulers of the country who had successfully thrown off the Mohammedan yoke. Mr. Grant Duff, indeed, claims for Maratha history this particular feature of interest, and describes the Marathas as 'our predecessors in conquest in India whose power was gradually gaining strength, before it found a head in the far-famed advanturer, Shivaji Bhonsle'. Except in Bengal and on the Coromandel Coast, the Powers displaced by the English conquest were not Mohammedan Subedars but native Hindu rulers who had successfully asserted their independence." The Maratha power rose in Western Maharashtra and soon its influence extended to Central Deccan, Karnatak, South India as far as Tanjore, including Mysore. It also embraced Gujarat including Saurashtra, Berar and Nagpur, Malwa in Central India, Bundelkhand, Rajputana, Northern India including Delhi, Agra, the Doab and Rohilkhand. Bengal and Oudh were also invaded but were protected from conquest by the interposition of British armies. For fifty years, the Emperors of Delhi were made or unmade by the agents of the Maratha power. That territory was completely under the power of the members of the Maratha Confederacy or old Hindu rulers in subordinate alliances with it. The head of this Confederacy was the Peshwa who was not only the chief military leader in his own country but was also the Deputy to the Delhi Emperors, kept prisoners in Mughal palaces at Delhi. For all practical purposes, the chief power in the country was in the hands of Hindu rulers controlled by the Marathas. The Muslim influence had spent itself and the Hindus had asserted their position and become independent rulers of the country with whom the British power had to contest for supremacy.

Ranade also pointed out that the rise of Maratha power was not the work of one man or of a succession of gifted men. The foundation of a national consciousness was laid broad and deep in the hearts of the Maratha people. It was the upheaval of the whole population, strongly bound together by the common affinities of language, race, religion and literature and seeking further solidarity by a common, independent, political existence. It was a national movement in which all classes cooperated. It had a stronger hold on the vast mass of the rural population. There were class ascendancies and clannish feelings even among the Marathas but they were kept under by a political sense of the population in general who joined the national armies for six months in the year and returned to their homes and cultivated

their family lands, enjoying their Vatans in the remaining period. Regard for Vatans was a marked feature of Maratha character and even commanders of great armies prided themselves more upon their being Patils and Deshmukhs in their old villages in Maharashtra than on their extensive Jagirs in the distant lands. It was this force behind which supported the efforts of the leaders and enabled them to dream of the possibility of the establishment of a central Hindu Padshahi or Empire at Delhi uniting and controlling all other native powers.

Ranade also pointed out that it was not a mere political revolution that stirred Maharashtra towards the close of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth century. The political revolution was preceded and to some extent caused by a religious and social upheaval which moved the entire populaiton. The popular idea that it was religious persecution which agitated Maharashtra and strengthened the hands of Shivaji and his comrades is not wholly wrong, but it represents only a partial truth. The fact was that like the Protestant Reformation in Europe in the sixteenth century, there was a religious, social and literary revival and reformation in India, notably in the Deccan in the 15th and 16th centuries. This religious revival was not Brahmanical in its orthodoxy. "It was heterodox in its spirit of protest against forms and ceremonies and class distinctions based on birth and ethical in its preference of a pure heart and of the law of love to all other acquired merits and good works. This religious revival was also the work of the people of the masses and not of the classes. At its heads were saints and prophets, poets and philosophers who sprang chiefly from the lower orders of society such as tailors, carpenters, potters, gardeners, shopkeepers, barbers and even Mahars, more often than Brahmans." The political leaders acted in concert with these religious leaders of the people. The chief adviser of Shivaji was Ramdas who gave the colour to the national flag and introduced a new form of salutation which displayed the religious character of the movement and independence of the spirit. Ranade emphasized the fact that Shivaji claimed direct inspiration for his activities from the Goddess Bhawani and on critical occasions in his life, he always guided himself by that inspiration.

According to Ranade, the great achievement of Shivaji was that be realised the danger from the North, kept the separatist tendencies under control, brought the common forces together in the name of a common religion and represented in himself not only the power of the age, but the soul-stirring idea that could animate the Marathas in a common cause. Shivaji did not create the Maratha power. That power had already been created, though scattered in small centres all over the country. He sought to unite it for a higher purpose by directing it against the common danger. This was his chief achievement and his chief service to the country. It was not for nothing that the people looked up to him as their inspired leader. He felt the inspiration himself and communicated it to those about him, not only in one generation but for generations more to come after him till the idea of re-establishing the Hindu power throughout the country was realised

Ranade writes, "Shivaji had the magnetic power which only true leaders of men possess and which neither bandits nor mad fanatics can ever claim. He attracted towards himself all that was hopeful and inspiring in the

land without distinction of class or caste or creed or colour. His very councillors were selected from all the great communities which constituted the strength of the country. His touch made the very grossest of men feel the cleansing fire burning within them." Again, "Shivaji's self-discipline was as great as his power of control and his military daring. This characteristic of his nature stands out in marked contrast with the looseness and ferocity of those times....Religious fervour, almost at white heat, bordering on the verge of self-abnegation, a daring and adventurous spirit born of a confidence with a higher power than man's protected him and his work, the magnetism of superior genius which binds men together and leads them to victory, a rare insight into the real needs of the times and a steadfastness of purpose which no adverse turn of fortune could conquer, a readiness and resourcefulness rarely met either in Indian or European history, a true patriotism which was far in advance of the times and a sense of justice tempered with mercy—these were the sources of the strength that enabled Shivaji to sow the seeds of a power which accomplished in the hands of his successors all that he had planned out and enabled his race to write a chapter in Indian history." His final summing up is contained in the following sentence at the end of the book : "They are strong when they confederate and unable to retain independence when the union is broken up."

Estimate

Ranade stood for peaceful progress. He shunned every kind of strife. His view was that the Indians had to learn a lot from the British for a sufficiently long time and they must do so with patience. Ultimately, the Indians will become a great nation. T. V. Parvate writes, "Of Ranade it could be said truly and with full justification that cirucmstances did not permit him heroic actions, or better still, he was not temperamentally so inclined, but was moulded for the role of a constructive national builder. Calmness and steadiness of mind which he possessed in an extraordinary measure, prevented him from being exhilerated or excited and made him work patiently and unceasingly without being upset or depressed. Subjecting himself to severe discipilne, he developed marvellous self-control, forbearance and equanimity. No man judged himself more severely and others more charitably than Ranade. He was scarcely known to lose his temper or return abuse for abuse. He readily forgave, harboured no resentment and made no enemies if he could help it. He chose the path of conciliatory cooperation for steady progress in all directions and mentally equipped himself for the same." A similar tribute was paid to Ranade by Gokhale in these words, "His saintly disposition, even more than his intellectual gifts, won for him the devoted admiration and attachment of large numbers of his countrymen throughout India." Again, "Born a few centuries ago, Ranade would have found his place by the side of saints like Tukaram or Eknath." According to Dr. Karve, Ranade "was a great man, a fervent patriot, a religious reformer and a leader of thought, a guide of men, an able historian and an eminent economist." Ranade brought to the work of national and social reconstruction of India an intensity of conviction which left a deep influence on the mind and heart of the young workers in India. Tilak wrote, "The first characteristic of Ranade was that he believed in all-sided and not lop-sided development of the nation. It was not only Maharashtra that occupied his mind, though that was the immediate area of activity, but the whole of

India." The view of Dr. V. P. Varma is that "Ranade was a modern Rishi. He was a teacher who inculcated the ideals of social emancipation, economic progress, cultural growth and national unity....Ranade stands out in Indian history and politics as the prophet of patriotism and one of the promulgators of the ideals of liberty, social progress and the rehabilitation of personal character. As a prophet, he has given the message of self-abnegation and constant perseverance. Ranade was, thus, the teacher of an exalted Indian nationalism."

SUGGESTED READINGS

Appadorai, A. : *Indian Political Thinking in the Twentieth Century from Naoroji to Nehru : An Introductory Survey*, Oxford University Press, 1971.

Bipen Chandra : *The Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India*, New Delhi, 1966.

Brown, D.M. : *The National Movement, Indian Political Thought from Ranade to Bhave*, Barkeley, 1961.

Buch, M.A. : *Rise and Growth of Indian Liberalism*; Baroda, 1938.

Chintameni, C.Y. : *Indian Social Reform*.

Gopalkrishnan, P.K. : *Development of Economic Ideas in India*, New Delhi, 1959.

Jagirdar, P.J. : *Studies in the Social Thought of M.G. Ranade*, Bombay, 1963.

Karve, D.G. : *Ranade : The Prophet of Liberated India*, Poona, 1942.

Kellock, James : *Mahadeva Govind Ranade*, Calcutta, 1926.

Mankar, G.A. : *A Sketch of the Life and Work of the Late Mr. Justice M.G. Ranade*, 2 Vols, Bombay, 1902.

Natarajan, S. : *A Century of Social Reform in India*.

Parvate, T.V. : *Mahadev Govind Ranade*, Asia Publishing House, 1963.

Ranade, M.G. : *Essays on Indian Economics*, Bombay, 1899.

Ranade, M.G. : *Religious and Social Reform : A Collection of Essays and Speeches*, Bombay, 1900.

Ranade, M.G. : *Rise of the Maratha Power*, Bombay, 1900.

Ranade, M.G. (Ed.) : *The Miscellaneous Writings of the Late Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.G. Ranade*, Bombay, 1915.

Ranade, R. : *Ranade : His Wife's Reminiscences*, Tr.K. Deshpande, Delhi, 1963.

Tucker, Richard P. : *Ranade and the Roots of Indian Nationalism*, Bombay, 1977.

Wolpert, Stanley A. : *Tilak and Gokhale : Revolution and Reform in the Making of Modern India*, Berkeley, 1962.

CHAPTER XII

Gopal Krishna Gokhale (1866-1915)

Gokhale was a constructive statesman of the first rank, an idealist and a phophet of a new era of international goodwill and cooperation. He was the trusted tribune of the people. He was a man of truth, rectitude and character. He was a patriot whom Gandhiji himself regarded as his Master and a perfect man in the political field. He was a great leader among the Moderates.

He was born on 9 May 1866 in a small village in Ratnagiri District of Maharashtra in a Chitpavan Brahman family. He lost his father when he was 13. As a student, he led a very hard life. He was a quiet, industrious and ambitious boy. At the age of 20, he began to teach in the Fergusson College, Poona. He was called "Professor to order" as he taught History, Political Economy, Mathematics and English literature according to the requirements of the institution. He caught the eye of Ranade in 1887 and became his disciple and continued to be so till the death of Ranade in 1901. This apprenticeship for thirteen years gave Gokhale a good grounding in Indian politics and economics and also an excellent start in his political career. In 1890, he became the Secretary of the Sarvajanik Sabha. In 1897, Ranade sent him to London to appear before the Welby Commission and he carried out his mission admirably. He entered the Bombay Council in 1899 and the Imperial Council in 1901. He was at his best in the Council Chamber. In December 1903, he was elected Joint General Secretary of the Indian National Congress and in 1905 he was elected the President of the Indian National Congress at its Banaras session. In 1905, he founded the Servants of India Society with its headquarters at Poona with a view to spiritualize public life in India. He denounced the partition of Bengal which he described as a "cruel wrong inflicted on our Bengali brethren . . a complete illustration of the worst features of bureaucratic rule in India, its utter contempt for public opinion, its arrogant pretensions to superior wisdom, its reckless disregard of the most cherished feelings of the people and its cool preference of service interests to those of the governed."

Gokhale played an important part in the passage of the Minto-Morley Reforms and considered them as "a large and generous concession" by the Government to the people of India. In 1911, he introduced in the Imperial Council a Bill for compulsory primary education in India but the same was defeated. When the Royal Commission on Public Services in India was set up in 1912, Gokhale was appointed one of its members and he worked very hard as a member of that Commission. In 1912, he visited South Africa and played a crucial role behind the scenes as the adviser of Gandhiji and the Viceroy, Lord Hardinge. He died on 18 February 1915 at the age of 49.

Moderate Leader

Gokhale was a great Moderate leader but he lacked capacity for party organisation and hence preferred to follow the leadership of Sir Pherozeshah Mehta rather than assert himself. Lord Morley wrote to Lord Minto in 1907, "I have often thought during the last twelve months that Gokhale as a party manager is a baby".

Influence of Burke

Gokhale was very much influenced by Burke's "Reflections on the French Revolution". Like Burke, Gokhale came to believe that no progress is possible without order and stability and hence he emphasized the necessity of the British connection and the usefulness of British bureaucracy which alone stood for order in the country at that time. Gokhale wrote thus to a member of the Servants of India Society in May 1907, "You must all realise that whatever the shortcomings of the bureaucracy and however intolerable at times the insolence of individual Englishmen, they alone stand today in the country for order and without continued order no real progress is possible for our people. It is not difficult at any time to create disorder in that country—it was our portion for centuries—but it is not so easy to substitute another form of order for that which has been evolved by Englishmen in the course of a century." However, Gokhale did not share with Burke his conservatism although he shared his moderation which became the watchword of Gokhale's public life. It is worthy of notice that Gokhale did not have his connection with the Conservative Party of England but with the Liberal Party of England. He rejoiced whenever the Liberal Party came to power in England. He had the best of relations with Lord Morley, the Secretary of State for India, who was a Liberal.

Gokhale was also influenced by Prof. List, the German Economist. Gokhale quoted Prof. List while advocating a policy of protection for the infant industries in India.

Indian Traditions

Gokhale also drew his inspiration from Indian traditions. He did not like the evils which had crept into the Hindu society and would like to remove them at any cost, but he emphasized the fact that we must preserve what is good and noble in our past. His view was that India at one time was "the home of all that is great and noble in the life of a nation—noble religion, noble philosophy and literature and art of every kind". He was proud of his Indian heritage. He took pains to point out that the Hindus were not as bad as they were depicted to be. They were not only subjects but also rulers, As a matter of fact, the British conquered India not from the Muslims but from the Hindus as the Mughhal Empire had practically disintegrated when the English appeared on the Indian scene.

Politics as religion

Gokhale wanted to raise politics to the level of religion but his religion is not to be understood in the dogmatic sense but in the sense of ethics and morals. In that sense, he not only preached the spiritualisation of politics but also practised it. All his utterances and actions were characterised by truth and honesty.

His patriotism

Gokhale was a great patriot and he loved passionately both his country and the people. He declared, "I recognise no limits to my estimations for our Motherland. I want our people to be in their own country what other people are in theirs". Although he believed in the capacity of his countrymen, he did not over-simplify the task of political and economic reconstruction in India. He wrote to a friend in September 1909, "Our problem is indeed an enormously difficult one. I sometimes think that no country in the world has ever been called upon to solve such a problem as ours. Endless divisions and sub-divisions in the country, the bulk of populations negligent and clinging with a tenacity of which only those who are of them can have an adequate conception, to old modes of thought and sentiment which are averse to all change and do not undestand the change; the seventy millions of Mohammendans more or less hostile to national aspirations and all power lodged in the hands of a fleeting body of foreign officials, most of whom generally represent Tory principles at their worst—this is the situation today. Out of this mass, an India has to be evolved, strong, free, united, democratic and qualified generally to take her proper place among the nations of the world". Knowing these difficulties, Gokhale insisted on following a policy of caution and working in cooperation with the British Government.

Gokhale had faith in British Liberalism. He appealed to the better nature and sense of fairplay of the English public. He visited England seven times in 1897, 1905, 1906, 1908,1912,1913 and 1914. One of the objects of his visits to that country was to acquaint the people of England with the problems facing the people of India and appeal to them to do justice to the people of India. He continued to work with that faith. In his budget speech of 1902, he declared, "What is needed is that we should be enabled to feel that we have a Government national in spirit though foreign in personnel—a Government which subordinates all other considerations to the welfare of the Indian people, which resents the indignities offered to Indians abroad as though they were offered to Englishmen, and which endeavours by all means in its power to further the moral and material interests of the people in India and outside India. The statesman who evokes such a feeling among the Indian people will render a great and glorious service to this country and will secure for himself an abiding place in the hearts of our people. Nay, he will do more—he will serve his own country in a true spirit of Imperialism—not the narrower Imperialism which regards the world as though it was made for one race only and looks upon subject races as if they were intended to be mere footstools of that race but that nobler Imperialism which would enable all who are included in the Empire to share equally in its blessings and honours."

India and England

Gokhale believed in harmonious cooperation between India and England. He wanted India to be a part of the British Empire and to continue to progress within the Empire. He was convinced that the emancipation of the Indian people was an arduous process of political education which was not to be achieved by asserting the birth-right of national indepenence but by slow progress towards social, economic and political maturity. The

Moderate Leader

Gokhale was a great Moderate leader but he lacked capacity for party organisation and hence preferred to follow the leadership of Sir Pherozeshah Mehta rather than assert himself. Lord Morley wrote to Lord Minto in 1907, "I have often thought during the last twelve months that Gokhale as a party manager is a baby".

Influence of Burke

Gokhale was very much influenced by Burke's "Reflections on the French Revolution". Like Burke, Gokhale came to believe that no progress is possible without order and stability and hence he emphasized the necessity of the British connection and the usefulness of British bureaucracy which alone stood for order in the country at that time. Gokhale wrote thus to a member of the Servants of India Society in May 1907, "You must all realise that whatever the shortcomings of the bureaucracy and however intolerable at times the insolence of individual Englishmen, they alone stand today in the country for order and without continued order no real progress is possible for our people. It is not difficult at any time to create disorder in that country—it was our portion for centuries—but it is not so easy to substitute another form of order for that which has been evolved by Englishmen in the course of a century." However, Gokhale did not share with Burke his conservatism although he shared his moderation which became the watchword of Gokhale's public life. It is worthy of notice that Gokhale did not have his connection with the Conservative Party of England but with the Liberal Party of England. He rejoiced whenever the Liberal Party came to power in England. He had the best of relations with Lord Morley, the Secretary of State for India, who was a Liberal.

Gokhale was also influenced by Prof. List, the German Economist. Gokhale quoted Prof. List while advocating a policy of protection for the infant industries in India.

Indian Traditions

Gokhale also drew his inspiration from Indian traditions. He did not like the evils which had crept into the Hindu society and would like to remove them at any cost, but he emphasized the fact that we must preserve what is good and noble in our past. His view was that India at one time was "the home of all that is great and noble in the life of a nation—noble religion, noble philosophy and literature and art of every kind". He was proud of his Indian heritage. He took pains to point out that the Hindus were not as bad as they were depicted to be. They were not only subjects but also rulers, As a matter of fact, the British conquered India not from the Muslims but from the Hindus as the Mughhal Empire had practically disintegrated when the English appeared on the Indian scene.

Politics as religion

Gokhale wanted to raise politics to the level of religion but his religion is not to be understood in the dogmatic sense but in the sense of ethics and morals. In that sense, he not only preached the spiritualisation of politics but also practised it. All his utterances and actions were characterised by truth and honesty.

His patriotism

Gokhale was a great patriot and he loved passionately both his country and the people. He declared, "I recognise no limits to my estimations for our Motherland. I want our people to be in their own country what other people are in theirs". Although he believed in the capacity of his countrymen, he did not over-simplify the task of political and economic reconstruction in India. He wrote to a friend in September 1909, "Our problem is indeed an enormously difficult one. I sometimes think that no country in the world has ever been called upon to solve such a problem as ours. Endless divisions and sub-divisions in the country, the bulk of populations negligent and clinging with a tenacity of which only those who are of them can have an adequate conception, to old modes of thought and sentiment which are averse to all change and do not undestand the change; the seventy millions of Mohammendans more or less hostile to national aspirations and all power lodged in the hands of a fleeting body of foreign officials, most of whom generally represent Tory principles at their worst—this is the situation today. Out of this mass, an India has to be evolved, strong, free, united, democratic and qualified generally to take her proper place among the nations of the world". Knowing these difficulties, Gokhale insisted on following a policy of caution and working in cooperation with the British Government.

Gokhale had faith in British Liberalism. He appealed to the better nature and sense of fairplay of the English public. He visited England seven times in 1897, 1905, 1906, 1908,1912,1913 and 1914. One of the objects of his visits to that country was to acquaint the people of England with the problems facing the people of India and appeal to them to do justice to the people of India. He continued to work with that faith. In his budget speech of 1902, he declared, "What is needed is that we should be enabled to feel that we have a Government national in spirit though foreign in personnel—a Government which subordinates all other considerations to the welfare of the Indian people, which resents the indignities offered to Indians abroad as though they were offered to Englishmen, and which endeavours by all means in its power to further the moral and material interests of the people in India and outside India. The statesman who evokes such a feeling among the Indian people will render a great and glorious service to this country and will secure for himself an abiding place in the hearts of our people. Nay, he will do more—he will serve his own country in a true spirit of Imperialism—not the narrower Imperialism which regards the world as though it was made for one race only and looks upon subject races as if they were intended to be mere footstools of that race but that nobler Imperialism which would enable all who are included in the Empire to share equally in its blessings and honours."

India and England

Gokhale believed in harmonious cooperation between India and England. He wanted India to be a part of the British Empire and to continue to progress within the Empire. He was convinced that the emancipation of the Indian people was an arduous process of political education which was not to be achieved by asserting the birth-right of national indepenence but by slow progress towards social, economic and political maturity. The

Western impact was the foundation of this progress and the British Empire was the frame-work for the construction of a modern political society in India. The problem was how to coordinate the growth of this political society with the evolution of the British Empire and how to prevent disparities and how to ward off reactionaries at home and abroad. Gokhale observed thus in 1903 : "The India of the future will, under Providence, not be an India of diminishing plenty, of empty prospect, or of justifiable discontent, but one of expanding industry, of awakened faculties, of increasing prosperity and of more widely distributed comfort and wealth. I have faith in the conscience and purpose of my own country and I believe in the almost illimitable capacities of this. But under no other conditions can this future be realised than the unchallenged supremacy of the Paramount Power, and under no other controlling authority is this capable of being maintained than that of the British Crown."

British bureaucracy in India

Gokhale himself pointed out the defects in the British bureaucracy in India. As the system was highly centralised and as the key officials served the country only for a limited purpose, they were not in a position to identify themselves constantly with the interests of the people. The officials looked at every question in relation to the maintenance of their own authority. The interests of the people of India were subordinated to that consideration. The exclusion of the Indian educated classes from power created discontent. While giving evidence before the Welby Commission in 1897, Gokhale said, "The excessive costliness of the foreign agency is not, however, its only evil. There is a moral evil which, if anything, is even greater. A kind of dwarfing or stunting of the Indian race is going on under the present system. We must live all the day of our life in an atmosphere of inferiority and the tallest of us must bend in order that the exigencies of the system may be satisfied."

Advice of Gokhale to Indians

Inspite of it, the view of Gokhale was that the Indians should not quarrel with the existing arrangements in a spirit of capriciousness but understand to the full and make as thorough a use as possible of all the opportunities available in th ecountry under the British regime. The development of those opportunities will depend to a large extent upon the temperate and responsible use the people of India made of them. They had to create traditions of constitutional Government and make a responsible use of all the liberty existing under the British Government. The English public, the English Parliament and the English Liberal Party, even the English Conservative Party, will not tolerate too much of "strong" rule in India. The criticism in England makes the officer in India always a little cautious and timid. Clive was called to question. Warren Hastings was impeached. The Lieutenant-Governor of Eastern Bengal and Assam had to resign. It was for the Indians to create an impression, both in India and in England that the public in India was becoming daily more and more conscious of its rights without ceasing to be conscious of its responsibilities, that the politician in India was not a negativist, not an irreconcilable, not a mischievous- agitator who had to be crushed in the imperial interest, but a shrewd, practical, intelligent, well-trained and sober, public man who deeply ap

preciated and made full use of all the latent and actual good there was in the British Government and its institutions in India, but who was fully alive to the anomalies of the British rule and who never missed an opportunity of studying exhaustively and criticizing impartially not only the details of administration but often the whole trend of Government policy and tried to bring that point of view again and again in all possible ways, both before the Indian and the British public as well as the official world.

Urgent need of India

The view of Gokhale was that the most urgent need of his countrymen was education in the techniques of administration, in the rudiments of public health and sanitation, in the skills of advanced technology, in the basic principles of communal harmony and social equality, in the methods of democratic agitation and in elementary reading and writing. Until the Indians learnt to subordinate familial, caste, regional and communal loyalties to the needs of the nation as whole, to substitute for the ethics of selfishness a standard of selfless national sacrifice, British rule would have to remain as the one force capable of maintaining internal peace throughout the land. The response of Gokhale to British rule was one of loyal acquiescence based on an over-riding faith in the integrity and beneficence of that which was the best in the British tradition. His was not the supine surrender of a sycophant or a mendicant to bureaucratic oppression. He had complete faith in the ultimate efficacy of his method of protests and demonstrations. His view was that the major responsibility of a public-spirited Indian was threefold: to present accurately the demands and opinions of Indian society to the Government, to interpret correctly the attitudes and actions of the Government to the people and to place before the bar of British public and official judgement those arbitrary and inequitable practices of the Government of India which he considered patently "un-British" in the highest sense and therefore in need of rectification. As the Editor of the Poona Sarvjanik Sabha journal, as a Congress leader, as a provincial and later supreme legislative Councillor, as founder and first member of the Servants of India Society, as an official delegate on several occasions to England and as a member of the Royal Commission, Gokhale laboured hard to fulfil this responsibility by petitions, public statements and personal appeals.

His difficult Position

The position of Gokhale was a difficult one. The Extremists in India dubbed him as a "faint-hearted Moderate" who was prepared to be a willing tool in the hands of the British Government. The reactionaries described him as a "seditionist in disguise". Lord Minto doubted his constancy. He wrote thus to Lord Morley in a letter of 7 August 1907: "I am thoroughly disappointed in Gokhale. I had liked what I had seen of him and believed he was honest at heart, but the part he has played of late has disgusted me. As an honest Moderate, he has lost a great opportunity of discountenancing rank sedition, and what you tell me of his references to your speech shows either that he is incapable of understanding the real friends of India or that he is, as you say, as big a revolutionary as Lajpat and the rest of them. It is very disappointing". Even Lord Morley was not completely free from prejudice against him. However, Gokhale firmly believed that the situation in India required "not the policeman's

baton or the soldier's bayonet but the statesman's insight, wisdom and courage." Gokhale was neither a revolutionary nor a reactionary. He hated both the extremes. He was a constructive statesman who understood and fought for the rights and liberties of the people of India but at the same time he was not prepared to ignore or belittle the difficulties of the Government of India. That is the reason why he supported the Indian Press Act, 1910 in the Imperial Legislative Council. Gokhale "interpreted popular aspirations to the Viceroy and the Government's difficulties to the Congress." The people criticised his moderation and the Government his extremism. His role was that of a unifier and a reconciler. His attitude can be best put in these words: "The Englishman who imagines that India could be governed much longer on the same lines as in the past and the Indian who thinks he must seek a destiny for his country outside this Empire, of which, for better or worse, we are a part—both alike show an inadequate appreciation of the realities of the present situation".

Self-Government

Gokhale did not demand Independence or national sovereignty for his country. The maximum that he desired was self-Government and that too within the British Empire. The view of B. C. Pal is that there was no difference between the Moderates and the Extremists as regards their political goal. Gokhale also wanted Swaraj but he did not believe in Swaraj as a theoretically perfect ideal. Gokhale was a perfect idealist and he knew that the attainment of Swaraj was not immediately possible in the existing political circumstances.

The term used by Gokhale was not Swaraj but self-Government. This he did because the term self-Government was easy to understand and more likely to be accepted by the people of England, but that term contained the substance of Swaraj.

In his Presidential address at the Banaras session of the Indian National Congress in 1905, Gokhale built up his case for the demand of self-Government on the ground that good Government had been guaranteed to India by Britain through so many promises and proclamations. To quote him, "Militarism, service interest and interest of the English capitalists all take precedence today over the true interests of the Indian people in the administration of the country. Things cannot be otherwise for it is the Government of the people of one by the people of another and this as Mill points out is bound to produce great evils. Now the Congress wants that all this should be governed first and foremost in the interests of the Indians themselves. This result will be achieved only in proportion as we obtain more and more voice in the Government of our country".

Gokhale put two important limitations on the demand for self-Government. The first limitation was that self-Government must be only within the British Empire and not separation from England and absolute independence. The latter objective was not capable of realisation at present. The second limitation was that the advance towards self-Government must be gradual as "at each stage of the progress it may be necessary for us to pass through a brief course of apprenticeship before we are able to go to the next one; for it is a reasonable proposition that the sense of responsibility required for the proper exercise of the political institutions of the West

can be acquired by an Eastern people through practical training and experiment only". However, this does not mean that Gokhale was opposed to all attempats to reform on the ground that the people were not ready for it. He quoted the view of Gladstone that it is liberty alone which fits men for liberty. Moreover, he insisted that "the resources of the country should be primarily devoted to the work of qualifying the people by means of education".

At the Calcutta session of the Indian National Congress held in 1906, Swaraj was declared to be the goal of the Indian National Congress. At the Surat session of the Congress in 1907, there was an apprehension that Gokhale and Pherozeshah Mehta would change the political goal of the Congress from that of Self-Government similar to that enjoyed by the self-governing members of the British Empire to "the system of Government similar to that enjoyed by the members of colonies of the British Empire". However, that fear did not materialise. Under the leadership of Gokhale, the Surat Congress stated in the first Article of its Constitution that "the objects of the Indian National Congress are the attainment by the people of India of a system of Government similar to that enjoyed by the self-governing members of the British Empire and a participation by them in the rights and responsibilities of the Empire on equal terms with those members".

Under the leadership of Gokhale, the Congress demanded the Indianisation of services, both civil and defence, and the right to participate in the Government. The view of Gokhale was that the question of the Indianisation of public services was such that it transcended all others in importance. He also demanded that Indians must be increasingly associated with the defence of their country. This was one of the points urged by him before the Welby Commission. Gokhale's view was that the military expenditure of the Government of India should be reduced by Indianising the army and public defence should be a matter of national concern. To quote Gokhale, "No pouring out of money like water on mere standing battalions can ever give India the military strength and preparedness which other civilised countries possess while the whole population is disarmed and the process of demilitarisation continues apace. India is about the only country in the civilized world where the people are debarred from the privileges of citizen soldiership and from all voluntary participation in the responsibilities of national defence." Again, "When we agitate for admission to the higher ranks of the public service, our claim is for participation in the responsibilities of Government. We want to occupy in our own country places which develop resourcefulness and strength of character and the capacity to take the initiative and which virtually represent the differences between men who rule and who merely obey".

Swadeshi

At the Banaras session of the Congress in 1905 presided over by Gokhale, he himself advocated Swadeshi as the only resort of the people to fight the adverse economic forces in the country. He supported the Swadeshi movement in these words: "The true Swadeshi movement is both a patriotic and an economic movement. The idea of Swadeshi or 'one's own country' is one of the noblest conceptions that have ever stirred the

heart of humanity.... The devotion to the Motherland, which is enshrined in the highest Swadeshi, is an influence so profound and so passionate that its very thought thrills and its actual touch lifts one out of oneself. The Swadeshi movement, as it is ordinarily understood, presents one part of this gospel to the mass of our people in a form which brings it within their comprehension. It turns their thoughts to their country, accustoms them to the idea of voluntarily making some sacrifice for her sake, enables them to take an intelligent interest in her economic development and teaches them the important lesson of cooperating with one another for a national end.. But the movement on its material side is an economic one and though self-denying ordinances, extensively entered into, must serve a valuable economic purpose, namely, to ensure a ready consumption of such articles as are produced in the country and to furnish a perpetual stimulus to production by keeping the demand for indigenous things largely in excess of the supply, the difficulties that surround the question economically are so great that they require the cooperation of every available agency to surmount them."

However, Gokhale was not in favour of boycott. His view was that a weapon like boycott must be reserved for extreme occasions. There are obvious risks involved in its failure. It cannot be used with sufficient effectiveness unless there is an extraordinary upheaval of popular feeling behind it. It is bound to arouse angry passions on the other side and a true well-wisher of his country will be responsible for provoking such passions except under an overpowering sense of necessity. Of course, on an extreme occasion a boycotting demonstration is perfectly legitimate, but that occasion must be one to drive all the classes, as in Bengal, to act with one impulse and make all leaders sink their personal differences in the presence of a common danger. About the boycotting of the existing schools and their replacement by national schools, Gokhale pointed out that that would take years and demand a tremendous amount of sacrifice on the part of the people and that would be a difficult thing to expect.

Constitutional Agitation

Gokhale was a Moderate. He was in favour of constitutional methods for the realisation of the goal of self-gvernment. He had no faith in revolutionary methods and both in his private talks and public utterances, he tried to expose the futility of revolutionary methods. He emphasized the consequences of lawlessness on the future Government of the country. He insisted that the progress on the road to self-Government must be gradual. To quote him, "It is not through sudden or violent cataclysm but only through successive steps that our goal is to be reached". Again, "Constitutional agitation was agitation by methods which they were entitled to adopt to bring about the changes they desired through the sanction of constituted authorities. Thus defined the field of constitutional reform was a very wide one. But there were two essential conditions, one that the methods adopted were such as they were entitled to employ and secondly that the changes desired must be obtained only through the action of constituted authorities by bringing to bear on them the pressure of public opinion."

Gokhale emphasized the fact that the employment of physical force was not within the scope of constitutional agitation. "Three things were ex-

cluded: rebellion, aiding or abetting a foreign invasion and resort to crime. Roughly speaking, barring all these three things all else was constitutional. No doubt everything that was constitutional was not necessarily wise or expedient, but that was a different matter. Prayers and appeals to justice lay at one end. Passive resistance, including even its extreme form of non-payment of taxes till redress was obtained, lay at the other end. Judged in that light, nothing that was being done at present in the country was unconstitutional, whatever one might think of the way some persons chose to express themselves."

At a meeting held on 9 September 1909 at the Townhall of Bombay, Gokhale said, "I think and I say this deliberately that in the circumstances of the Transvaal, Passive Resistance such as that organized by Mr. Gandhi is not only legitimate, but is a duty resting on all self-respecting persons. What is this passive resistance? Passive Resistance to an unjust law or an oppressive measure and a refusal to acquiesce in that law or measure and a readiness to suffer penalty instead which may be prescribed as an alternative. If we strongly and clearly and conscientiously feel the grave injustice of a law, and there is no other way to obtain redress, I think refusal to acquiesce in, taking the consequence of such refusal is the only course left to those who place conscience and self-respect above their material or immediate interests. I am sure we all think that Mr. Gandhi is perfectly justified in resorting to passive resistance when all other means of redress have failed".

At the Lahore session of the Congress, Gokhale explained the philosophy of passive resistance in these words: "It is essentially defensive in its nature and it fights with moral and spiritual weapons. A passive resister resists tyranny by undergoing suffering in his own person. He pits soul force against the brute in man, he pits suffering against oppression, he pits conscience against might, he pits faith against injustice, right against wrong. A passive resister deliberately and openly violates the requirements of an unjust law or order for the simple reason that he cannot conscientiously submit to that law or order. He does not seek to evade the consequences of that law but invites them and he glories in them. It is a spiritual struggle, essentially in keeping with the highest traditions of India spiritually".

Gokhale did not want India to adopt the type of passive resistance advocated by Tilak. He pleaded for passive resistance only a measure of defence and not of attack. He also wanted that passive resistance movement must be moral/spiritual and carried on without any desire of vindictiveness. The passive resister should not inflict sufferings on his opponent but invite the same on his own person.

The view of Gokhale was that the people will be justified in resorting to passive resistance only when all other means of redress had failed. However, he believed that all other methods of redress had not been tried and failed in India. His view was that even a thousandth part of the possibilities of constitutional agitation had not been exhausted in India's struggle for self-Government. Moreover, the method of passive resistance could not possibly be used in India as there was not enough popular feeling.

Those who advocated passive resistance maintained that the people

should have nothing to do with the Government of the country and by the simple process of universal boycott, they would be able to achieve everything they had in view. The answer of Gokhale was, "Talking of its practicability, I consider it a preposterous thing that anybody should imagine such a thing to be feasible in the present state of the country." Again, "Non-payment of taxes was the most direct, the most effective form of passive resistance and it had moreover the merit of bringing to each man the responsibility of his own action. If some of those who were talking of employing passive resistance to achieve self-government at the present stage of the country's progress would adopt that form of passive resistance, they would soon find out where they stood and how far they were supported."

Gokhale maintained that his policy was not one of mendicancy. He stood for the best and practical in political. To quote him, "We are not beggars and our policy is not that of mendicancy. We are ambassadors of our people at a foreign court, to watch and guard the interests of our country and get as much for her as we can. That is our position".

Gokhale defended the role and achievements of the Moderates in these words: "Let us not forget that we are at a stage of the country's progress when our achievements are bound to be small and our disappointments frequent and trying. That is the place which it has pleased Providence to assign to us in this struggle, and our responsibility is ended when we have done the work which belongs to that place. It will, no doubt, be given to our countrymen of future generations to serve India by their success; we, of the present generation, must be content to serve her mainly by our failures. For, hard though it be, out of those failures, the strength will come which in the end will accomplish great tasks." Again, "The minds of the people have been familiarised with the idea of a united India working for her salvation; a national public opinion has been created; close bonds of sympathy now knit together the different provinces; castes and creeds hamper less and less the pursuit of common aims; the dignity of a consciousness of national existence has spread over the whole land.. Above all, there is a general perception now of the goal towards which we have to strive and a wide recognition of the arduous character of the struggle and the immense sacrifices it requires."

Test of Progressive Government

In his speeches and writings, Gokhale pointed out certain tests by which it could be ascertained whether a particular Government was progressive or not. To quote him, "I suggest four tests to judge whether the Government is progressive, and further whether it is continuously progressive. The first test that I would apply is what measures it adopts for the moral and material improvement of the mass of people, and under these measures I do not include those appliances of modern governments which the British Government has applied in this country, because they were appliances necessary for its very existence, though they have benefited the people, such as the construction of Railways, the introduction of Posts and Teleghaphs, and things of that kind. By measures for the moral and the material improvement of the people, I mean what the Government does for education, what the Government does for sanitation, what the Government does for agricultural development, and so forth. That is my first test. The

second test that I would apply is what steps the Government takes to give us a large share in the administration of our local affairs—in municipalities and local boards. My third test is what voice the Government gives us in its Councils—in those deliberative assemblies, where policies are considered. And, lastly, we must consider how far Indians are admitted into the ranks of the public service."

A Liberal

Gokhale was a Liberal in the sense that he stood for individual liberty and representative institutions. He was inspired in his thinking by John Locke, Bentham and J. S. Mill. He had studied the writings of J. S. Mill and referred to him with great respect. He agreed with J. S. Mill regarding the value of individual liberty as an important factor for human progress. According to Gokhale, liberty did not imply the complete negation of restraint. There must be self-restraint, self-discipline and self-organisation. When he founded the Servants of India Soceity, he did not give its members unregulated and unrestrained individual liberty. They were required to abide by the rules and regulations of the society. Gokhale stood for a balance between individual liberty and order. He advocated the right of free expression in India in the same way and to same extent as it was allowed in Britain. He criticized the restrictions on the free press in India in the name of imaginary dangers. However, he was not opposed to the enactment of laws whose object was to check gross abuse of the right of free expression. Gokhale opposed the Official Secrets Bill, 1904 in these words: "My Lord, nowhere throughout the British Empire is the Government so powerful relatively to the governed as in India. Nowhere, on the other hand, is the press so weak in influence as it is with us. The vigilance of the press is the only check that operates from outside, feebly it is true, but continuously upon the conduct of the Government which is subject to no popular control. It is here, therefore, if anywhere, that the legislature should show special consideration to the press, and yet here alone it is proposed to arm Government with a greater power to control the freedom of the press than in any other part of the Empire." Again, "The press is in one sense like the Government a custodian of public interests and any attempt to hamper its freedom by repressive legislation is bound to affect these interests prejudicially and cannot fail in the end to react upon the position of the Government itself".

Right to Private Property and Freedom of Contract

Gokhale defended the right to private property. Speaking on the Land Revenue Code Amendment Bill, Gokhale observed: "My Lord, the ordinary citizen is as tenaciously attached to his proprietary rights over his holding and he finds the full enjoyment of these rights so useful in actual life, that there is nothing he will not do if it is in his power to ward off what he regards as a direct or indirect attack on these rights. And it is difficult to understand that a proposal to take away from his power of alienating when necessary his holding should appear to him to be a most serious encroachment on his rights." For the same reason, Gokhale opposed the Land Alienation Bill introduced by the Government in the Bombay Legislative Council in 1901. His contention was that the policy of limiting the rights of the agriculturist was no solution for his difficulties. Such a blil dep-

rived the peasant of his right over the land and amounted to nationalisation of the land and state landlordism.

Gokhale also insisted on the freedom of contract and he opposed the Cantonment House Accommodation Bill in the Imperial Legislative Council in 1902 in these words: "A legislation of so exceptional a character, interfering as it does with the normal freedom of contract between house-owners and tenants can be justified only on grounds of the strongest necessity."

Representative Institutions

Gokhale demanded not only individual liberty but also the establishment of genuine representative institutions in the country. To quote him, "The first requisite then of improved relations on an enduring basis between Englishmen and Indians, is an unequivocal declaration in England to put her resolve to help forward the growth of representative institutions in India and a determination to stand by this policy, in spite of all temptations or difficulties." However, Gokhale did not demand universal enfranchisement even for village Panchayats. The right of vote was to be given only to those who possessed property qualifications. The view of Gokhale was that the educated Indians represented the masses of India. They were the natural leaders of the people and what they thought today, the rest of India thought on the following day.

Gokhale also believed in giving representation to various interests among the people. Thus he pleaded for one seat each in the Bombay Legislative Council for the Karachi Chamber, the Ahmedabad Mill Owners and the Deccan Sardars. He also accepted the principle of special representation for religious minorities. However, this does not mean that he believed in the policy of separate electorates. The view of Lady Minto is that Gokhale proposed separate electorates, but this is not correct. The system advocated by Gokhale was that special electorates should provide not the whole of the representation to which a minority was entitled but only so much of it as was necessary to redress the inequalities of general elections. The great merit of the scheme advocated by Gokhale was that it ensured the election of Hindus and Muslims free from all traces of bigotry.

Gokhale was in favour of giving voting rights only to the tax-payers. He was also inclined to favour the educated as against the uneducated masses for purposes of enfranchisement. He proposed the system of proportional representation to provide against inadequate representation of minorities.

Role of the State

The view of Gokhale was that it was the duty of the Government to further the moral and material interests of the people and for that purpose the Government must remove all restrictions from the path of their development. The people should be given opportunities to grow to the full height of their stature. He stood for "a Government which subordinates all other considerations to the welfare of Indian people, which resents the indignities offered to Indians abroad as though they were offered to Englishmen and which endeavours by all means in its power to further the moral and material interests of the people in India and outside India." Again,

"I want our people to be in their country what other people are in their own country. I want our men and women without distinctions of caste or creed to have opportunities to grow to the full height of their statures unhampered by cramping and unnatural restrictions".

Gokhale did not believe in a police state. He wanted the state to be more than a police state. In addition to the maintenance of law and order, the state must perform all those functions which remove hindrances and hardships from the path of the development of individual personality. His view was that the use of liquor, opium and tobacoo was a curse to humanity and a hindrance to the development of human personality and hence the same must be stopped by the Government. Liwewise, the Government must adopt measures for the maintenance of public health. He stood for universal elementary education on the ground that "elementary education for the mass of the people meant something more than a mere capacity to read and write. It meant for them a keener enjoyment of life and a more refined standard of living. It meant the greater moral and economic efficiency of the individual. It meant a higher level of intelligence for the whole community generally."

The view of Gokhale was that the state must undertake developmental functions for industrial development and agricultural prosperity. He was in favour of raising more funds by fresh taxation so that the additional money may be spent on developmental purposes. He was emphatic that whenever there was a surplus budget, the surplus must be devoted to the work of promoting developmental functions of the state. He criticized the Government for having surplus budgets when practically nothing was being done for the welfare of the people.

He wanted the Government to open cooperative societies and agricultural banks to provide facilities to the agriculturists to borrow at a lower rate of interest for their constructive and productive expenditure. Measures should also be adopted to clear the agricultural indebtedness. He was opposed to the increase in land revenue demanded by the state. He was in favour of a scheme of permanent settlement to cover the whole country. He wanted the Government to give paramount importance to irrigation and scientific agriculture.

Gokhale was very unhappy that India was becoming a predominantly agricultural country, producing the raw materials to be exported to England and getting finished goods from there. He advocated the abolition or reduction of excise duties in India. He also wanted the Government to follow the policy of protection towards infant industires in India as advocated by Prof. List. He wanted the level of public taxation to be low so that there was scope for the growth of trade and industry in the country.

Gokhale did not approve of the "drain" theory of Dadabhai Naoroji. According to him, it was a lack of the knowledge of the laws of political economy to suppose that a country which exports more than it imports and which borrows capital in foreign countries or pays highly for the services of foreign experts it employs, is in a bad condition and is bound to go to ruin. These payments were not gratuitous and were made for the benefits received. If we want railways for the development of the resources of the country and cannot raise the necessary capital, we must

borrow in London where it is obtainable at cheap rates. We want an army and a navy for the defence of the country and must pay for it. These considerations must be kept in mind by those who condemn the Home Charges as a drain on the wealth of India. However, Gokhale maintained that the policy of the Government should be to train the people of India so that the charges paid by India may turn out to be a really good investment. Our effort should be to substitute Indian agency in place of the foreign agency in all departments. The high civil and military posts should be open to Indians and that would reduce the Home Charges. Gokhale agreed with the view that the administration of India was costly and a reduction must be made by employing Indians and using Indian things. He did not approve of the heavy costs of military operations carried on beyond the frontiers of India. The Government must not maintain a large European army in India on a war footing even in time of peace. He admitted that there was an increase in Government expenditure in almost all Western countries. but that was in the interests of the people themselves That was not true of India. To quote Gokhale, "While increased expenditure in other countries under popular control has, so far as we are able to judge, helped to bring increased strength and security to the nations and increased enlightenment and prosperity to the people, our continually growing expenditure has, in our opinion, under autocratic management, defective constitutional control, and the inherent defects of alien domination only helped to bring about a constantly increasing exploitation of our resources, has retarded our material progress, weakened our natural defences and burdened us with undefined and indefinable financial liabilities".

Fallacy of Surplus Budgets

The Government of India attributed the surplus budgets in the early years of the 20th century to the growing prosperity of the people which was refuted by Gokhale. To quote him, "A surplus of seven crores of rupees is perfectly unprecedented in the history of Indian finance, and coming as it does on the top of a series of similar surpluses realised, when the country has been admittedly passing through very trying times, it illustrates to my mind in a painfully clear manner the utter absence of a due correspondence between the condition of the people and the condition of the finances of the country. They are wrong in the first instance in that they exist at all—that Government should take so much more from the people than is needed in times of serious depression and suffering; and they are also wrong because they land themselves to every mis-interpretation and, among other things, render possible the phenomenal optimism of the Secretary of State of India who seems to imagine that all is for the best in this best of lands." Gokhale pointed out that the surpluses were mainly, almost entirely, currency surpluses, resulting from the fact that the Government still maintained the same level of taxation which was considered to be necessary to secure financial equilibrium when the rupee stood at its lowest. To quote Gokhale, "One of these cardinal principles of finance was that the level of taxation should not be higher than was absolutely necessary, and if there were surpluses, they should be spent on urgent reforms such as education. liberal and technical, sanitation etc., calculated to promote the material and moral well-being of the people, or they should be returned to the people by remission of taxes." Gokhale pointed out that the most

pressing needs of the country in regard to the moral and material advancement of the people continued unattended. He advocated the reduction of state demand on land. The agriculturists must be given relief from the load of debt which overwhelmed them. Facilities must be provided to them to enable them to borrow on occasions for reasonable wants at a low rate of interest. Irrigation facilities must be extended and scientific agriculture promoted. Industrial and technical education should be promoted. Primary education was absolutely necessary to remove the extreme poverty of the people.

Policy of Protection

Gokhale advocated the policy of protection in India which he considered was absolutely essential for the advancement of the country. To quote him, "Free trade for all countries may be alright in theory but it will be a long, long day before we shall have it in practice everywhere. And until that time comes, every country must take care of its economic interests in its own way. At present most countries have adopted protection as their economic policy. It is, however, necessary to remember that there are two kinds of proetction, the right kind and the wrong kind. The right kind of protection is that under which the growing industries of a country receive the necessary stimulus and encouragement and support that they require but under which care is taken that no influential combination, prejudicial to the interests of the community, came into existence. The wrong kind of protection, on the other hand, is that under which powerful influences and combinations and interests receive assistance to the prejudice of the general community, the general tax-payers of the country and I believe that the right kind of protection, if available, will be good to India."

Gokhale wanted the Government of India to follow the advice of List, the great German economist, to give protection to the infant industries of India. Gokhale knew that "for a long time to come this will not be practicable and as practical men, we must accept the situation and make the best of it. For the present, we should ask the state to give only such help to the industry as it can without running counter to the principles which are at present in the ascendant in the administration of this country."

Social Reform

In the matter of social reform, the view of Gokhale was that the state must help the progressive elements in society to bring about the desired social change through legislation. This view was based on his belief that the educated classes were the natural leaders of the Indian masses. What they thought today, the masses thought on the next day.

Though Gokhale was a keen economist, he was also a spiritualist and idealist. He stood for the spiritualisation of politics. He introduced morality in politics. He believed in the inherent goodness and nobility of man. He advocated moderation, reason and compromise in politics. He accepted the concepts of negotiations, moderation and compromise. He was opposed to extreme measures. He was contented with moderate demands and hence accepted the Minto-Morley Reforms of 1909. He stood for decentralisation in administration. He advocated the imposition of restraints on the autocratic powers of bureaucracy. He was compared with Gladstone and As-

quith. Gandhiij described Gokhale "as pure as crystal, gentle as a lamb, brave as a lion and chivalrous to a fault and the most perfect man in the political field."

SUGGESTED READINGS

Aiyar, Patwardhan, Sapru, Gadgil and Ganguli : *Gokhale : The Man and His Mission*, Asia Publishing House, 1966.

Argov, Daniel : *Moderates and Extremists in the Indian Nationalist Movemen* (1883-1920), Asia Publishing House, 1967.

Damle, P.R. : *Gopal Krishna Gokhale*, Poona, 1961.

Deogirikar, T.R. : *Gopal Krishna Gokhale*, New Delhi, 1964.

Gandhi, M.K. : *Gokhale, My Political Guru*, Ahmedabad, 1955.

Gokhale, Gopal Krishna : *Speeches*, 3rd Ed. Natesan & Co. Madras, 1920.

Goyal, O.P. : *Political Thought of Gokhale*, Allahabad, 1965.

Hoyland, John S. : *Gopal Krishna Gokhale*, Calcutta, 1948.

Jagadisan, T.N. : *My Master Gokhale* (1964).

Kale, V.G. : *Gokhale and Economic Reforms*, Poona, 1916.

Maharashtra Information Centre : *Gopal Krishna Gokhale, A Centenary Tribute*, Bombay, 1966.

Mathur, D.B. : *Gokhale : A Political Biography*, Bombay, 1966.

Naidu. S. : *Reminiscences of Gokhale*. Poona.

Nanda, B.R. : *Gokhale*, London, 1977.

Nanda, B.R. : *Gokhale, Gandhi and the Nehrus : Studies in Indian Nationalism*, London, 1974.

Paranjpe, R.P. : *Gopal Krishna Gokhale*, Poona, 1915.

Parvate, T.V. : *Gopal Krishna Gokhale*, Navajiwan Trust, 1959.

Patwardhan, R.P. and Ambedkar, D.V. (Eds.) : *Speeches and Writings of Gopal Krishna Gokhale*, Poona, 1962.

Rao, B. Shiva : *India's Freedom Movement*, New Delhi, 1972.

Sastri, V.S. Srinivasa : *Life of Gopal Krishna Gokhale*, Bangalore, 1937.

Shahani, T.K. : *Gopal Krishna Gokhale, Spiritualisation of Public Life*, 1949.

Wacha, D.E. : *Reminiscences of the Late Hon. Mr. G.K. Gokhale*, Bombay, 1915.

Wolpert, S.A. : *Tilak and Gokhale : Revolution and Reform in the Making of Modern India*, Berkelay, 1962.

CHAPTER XIII

The Drain Theory

The "drain theory" occupied the minds of the prominent leaders of the nationalist movement in India. It acquired such wide popularity and influence over the mass mind in India that several British spokesmen were compelled to make herculean efforts to show that it was not correct.

Dadabhai Naoroji

Dadabhai Naoroji was the high priest of the drain theory and for years he carried on propaganda in its favour. His best exposition of the drain theory is to be found in his book entitled "Poverty and Un-British Rule in India". His view was that the economic drain from India was the real, the principal and even the sole cause of the loss, sufferings and poverty of India, all other reasons and causes being "only red herrings drawn across the path." His contention was that the drain facilitated penetration and exploitation of India by foreign capital. By preventing the accumulation of capital within India and by thus prostrating internal capital, the drain permitted foreign capitalists to come to the country without having to face any indigenous competition and thereby to monopolise and to reap all the advantages of India's material resources. The drain also acted as the chief source of the accumulation of foreign capital invested in India because a large part of the drain was brought back to India as foreign capital.

It was in 1867 that Dadabhai first put forward the idea that Britain was extracting wealth from India "as the price of her rule in India", that "out of the revenues raised in India, nearly one-fourth goes clean out of the country and is added to the resources of England" and that India was consequently "being continuously bled." He suggested that "the least that the British people can do is to lend back to India the wealth derived therefrom, in order to develop its resources." The same views were expressed by him in 1870 and 1871. While condemning the economic consequences of the drain, he believed in the value of political association between England and India and the resultant drain. To quote him, "If India is to be regenerated by England, India must make up its mind to pay the price." He advised the British Government to adjust its financial relations with India in an equitable manner. To quote him further, "I do not mean this as a complaint; you must have a return for the services rendered to India, but let us have the means of paying." He further declared that it was "the duty of England to give us such a Government and all the benefits of its power and credit, as to enable us to pay, without starving or dying by famine, the tribute or price for the rule". He called upon the British statesmen to find proper remedies so that the burden of economic drain from India to England may be reasonably lightened and the ability of the

people to pay the same may be increased. By 1876, the drain theory was fully crystallised in the mind of Dadabhai and he presented the same in a revised draft of "Poverty of India". Dadabhai literally dedicated his life to propagate the drain theory. He wrote in 1880 that "the most important question of the day is how to stop the bleeding drain from India. The merit or good of every remedy will depend upon and be tested by its efficacy in stopping this deplorable drain." In 1886, he observed: "The short of the whole matter is that under the present evil and unrighteous administration of Indian expenditure, the romance is the beneficence of the British rule, the reality is the 'bleeding' of the British rule". With the passage of time, the criticism of Dadabhai against the economic drain from India continued to increase and he employed such terms as unrighteous, despotic, plundering, unnatural, destructive etc. He held the British policy responsible for draining the life-blood of India and her welfare.

Ranade

There were other Indian leaders also who pointed out the evils of the economic drain from India. In his lecture delivered in 1872, Ranade criticised the drain of capital and resources from India. To quote him, "Out of the national income of India, more than one-third was taken away by the British in some form or other." In 1892, Ranade observed that to the old legacies and inherited weaknesses which acted as depressing influences on economic development "must be added the economic drain of wealth and talents which foreign subjection has entailed on the country."

Bholanath Chandra

In 1873, Bholanath Chandra pointed out the yawning gulf of the drain which was widening every year. According to him, the drain began when the English East India Company kept aside a portion of the Indian revenues for their commercial investments.

R. C. Dutt

Another exponent of the theory of economic drain was R. C. Dutt. In a speech delivered in 1901, he declared the drain from India to be "unexampled in any country on earth at the present day." He pointed out that "if England herself had to send out one-half of her annual revenues to be spent annually in Germany or France or Russia, there would be famines in England before long." In his Preface to the first volume of his book entitled "The Economic History of India" he pointed out that one-half of the net revenues of India went out of the country and "the moisture of India blesses and fertilises other lands." He further wrote in the book, "So great an economic drain out of the resources of a land would impoverish the most prosperous countries on earth; it has reduced India to a land of famines more frequent, more widespread and more fatal than any known in the history of India or of the world." In his Preface to the second volume of the book, he criticised the British Government for levying the annual tribute from India which was the poorest country. He also pointed out that contribution drained the life-blood of India in a continuous, ceaseless flow.

The other Indian leaders including G. V. Joshi, P. C. Ray, Madan

Mohan Malaviya, D. E. Wacha, Gokhale, G. Subramaniya Iyer and Surendranath Banerjea also criticized the economic drain from India. Many newspapers also criticised the economic drain. The view of the Amrit Bazar Patrika was that the economic drain was the one cause of India's poverty. India was "sucked in so many different ways and by so many parties that they are themselves ignorant of one another's whereabouts and doings, and of the extreme peril to which their patient is subjected by their operations". Again, "By this ceaseless drain India is improverished and England enriched. This arrangement reduces India to the condition of a property and the people to the condition of a cattle." Similar were the views of other Indian newspapers on this subject. In 1896, the Indian National Congress passed a resolution to the effect that the famines in India and the poverty of the people were brought about "by the drain of the wealth of the country which has been going on for years together".

The Indian leaders also pointed out the difference between the despotic rulers of India in the past and the British rulers. The Mughal or the Maratha rulers might plunder their people but their wealth remained within the country and was spent within it. Individual citizens might suffer or be oppressed and deprived of their wealth, but the country as a whole did not lose because the loss of one citizen became the gain of the other. However, under the British rule, wealth of India was taken out of the country and spent abroad. Even when the past rulers taxed the people heavily, the money collected remained in the country but the British rulers took away the money from the country. Even when a person like Nadir Shahh looted the country, he went back immediately and the loss of wealth was temporary. However, under the British, the drain of wealth from India was a continuous one. The Indian Spectator wrote in 1885, "You say the Mughal taxed us twice as much as you do. What if they did? They were the natives of India, or at all events they had adopted India as their home. Whatever revenue they raised by taxation, tyranny or plunder, they spent the same in the country. Not a pie went out of India. Whether they spent the money on the construction of irrigation canals, trunk roads and bridges, or on palaces and mausoleums or even on fire-works and dancing girls, it returned all to the people from whom it had been obtained."

Amount of Drain

Different writers came to different conclusions regarding the amount of economic drain from India. It depended upon the method followed by them to calculate the same. One view was that the amount of drain can be found out easily by taking the difference between the exports and imports of India. Dadabhai Naoroji added to the excess of exports over imports another large amount which was due to India but was not paid to it. That was the profits on its exports. He assumed that in the case of British and several other countries the excess of imports over exports represented profits of the exports. He also asserted that in calculating the total value of Indian exports and imports, while the price of exports was taken by the British officials as the cost price at the port of import, the price of British imports was regarded not as their cost price at the port of export (London) or even the cost price at the port of import (Bombay), but the market price at the port of import or that the British imports were inflated to the

extent of the profit on their sale in the Indian market. The result was that the amount of drain was actually much more than the same was indicated by the difference between the values of exports and imports.

Dadabhai himself calculated the economic drain from India. In 1867, he calculated the amount of drain to be £ 8 millions. He raised it to £ 12 millions. This annual drain continued to rise till it was more than £ 27 millions in 1872. The economic drain was more than Rs. 25 crores in 1893. The figure was about Rs. 359 crores for the ten years from 1883-92. The smallest amount was Rs. 2 crores for one year. The drain was calculated at Rs. 51.5 crores in 1905.

The view of G. V. Joshi was that India had been drained of nearly 660 million sterling during the period from 1834 to 1888. D. E. Wacha put the figure at Rs. 30 to 40 crores in one year. R. C. Dutt calculated that the drain was £ 20 millions a year in the opening years of the twentieth century. Prithwis Chandra Ray put the figure at £ 60 to 70 millions a year.

The economic drain from India was due to many reasons. This drain was partly due to the tribute paid by India to England in the form of payments to individual British citizens. Economic drain was also the result of Britain's political and economic domination.

Another important constituent of the economic drain was the remittance to England of a part of their salaries, incomes and savings by English civil, military and railway employees, lawyers, doctors etc. and the payment in England by the Government of India of the pensions and furlough allowances of the English officials. In other words, the drain was due to the employment of a large number of Europeans in Indian administration, army and railways. Dadabhai put the greatest emphasis on this factor. To quote him, "The sole cause of this extreme poverty and wretchedness of the mass of the people is the inordinate employment of foreign agency in the government of the country and the consequent material loss to and drain from the country." Again, "It is a question of life and death to the country. Remove but this one evil and India will be blessed in every way."

Another cause of economic drain from India was due to the Home Charges of the Government of India or expenditure incurred in England by the Secretary of State of India on behalf of the Indian Government. The Home Charges consisted of the payment of interest on the Indian public debt and the guaranteed railways, the cost of military and other stores supplied to India, and the civil and military charges paid in England on account of India, including the cost of the Secretary of State's establishment at the India Office and the payment of pensions and allowances to European officials of the Indian Government. It is pointed out that in 1902-3, the Home Charges amounted to £ 17,700,000 and were distributed as follows: railways revenue account £ 6,500,000, interest and management of debt £ 2,800,000, stores £ 1,800,000, army effective charges £ 1,300,000, civil administration £ 400,000, marine £ 200,000 and non-effective charges consisting mainly of the furlough and pension allowances of civil and military officers £ 4,700,000.

Another major source of the economic drain was the profits of private foreign capital invested in trade or industry in India.

Effects of the Economic Drain

A very important effect of the economic drain from the country was the impoverishment of its people. The view of Dadabhai was that the economic drain was the real, the principal and even the sole cause of the sufferings and poverty of the people of India. The other Indian leaders did not go to that extreme in holding the economic drain as the sole cause of India's poverty. Most of them were of the view that the economic drain was an important and perhaps the most important cause of India's poverty, but it was only one of the causes and not the sole cause. However, the drain made the country poor. Some Indian leaders considered the drain not only the loss of wealth but also the loss of capital.

Some Indian leaders pointed out that the transfer of national wealth from India had an important and harmful impact on income and employment within the country. The drain represented not only the sepnding abroad of a certain portion of national income but also the loss of employment and income that would have been generated inside the country if that amount had been spent inside it. R. C. Dutt wrote in 1903, "For when taxes are raised and spent in a country, the money circulates among the people, fructifies trades, industries and agriculture and in one shape or another reaches the mass of the people. But when the taxes raised in a country are remitted out of it, the money is lost to the country for ever; it does not stimulate her trade or industries or reach the people in any form." Surendranath Banerjea wrote in 1902 that "The conquerors of old soon made the conquered country their own and returned to the people money which they had wrung from the people. They thus stimulated the springs of domestic industry and contributed to the material prosperity of the people."

Dadabhai went to the extent of saying that even the salaries and incomes spent by the foreigners in India were a drain. According to him, what they consumed in India caused a partial loss to the people of India because it represented the eating up of the goods and services which the Indians would have otherwise consumed.

The view of the economists among the Indian leaders was that the economic drain denuded India of its productive capital. The economic drain was injurious because the accumulation of capital in the country was checked and retarded by the removal of a large part of its currently accumulating capital to a foreign land. In his book entitled "The Poverty of India", Dadabhai pointed out that the drain not only cut into the current national savings but even diminished the existing stock of inherited national capital. In 1887, Dadabhai wrote that "by the present policy British India is prevented from acquiring any capital of its own, owing to the constant drain from its wretched income." In 1895, he stated in the House of Commons that as a result of the drain, capital was withdrawn from India and the people of India were prevented from accumulating it. To quote him, "This compulsorily obtained benefit to England crippled the resources of British Indians who could never make any capital and must drag on a poverty-stricken life." He told Lord Welby in 1897 that if India

was "allowed to retain its resources instead of being bled by this foreign domination", she would be able to pay as taxation, if necessary, Rs. 2000 millions.

G. V. Joshi also considered the drain as a loss of capital. To quote him, "The full measure of this drain is not the ratio it bears to the gross annual income of the country—which is about 6 per cent—but its proportion to the net income after defraying the necessary expenditure of the year's maintenance of the Natives. And this proportion is nearly one-third. Full one-third of our net national income going out of the country to meet our foreign liabilities, and bringing no economic return,—this is certainly a heavy loss to the country and goes a long way to account for the small accumulations of capital it has to show." Similar views were expressed by D. E. Wacha and G. S. Iyer.

The view of some of the Indian leaders was that the economic drain, by producing the shortage of capital in the country, hindered her industrial development on which depended the economic salvation of India. According to them, the chief responsibility for the slow growth of modern industry in India lay at the head of the drain. According to Dadabhai, though industrialisation on a large scale was the most pressing need of Ind a, in practice industry was limited by the amount of available capital which was not enough. It did not enable India to go in freely with all its own resources to develop its own resources for its own benefit. If India was not deprived of her capital every year, she would certainly be able to develop her resources. Dadabhai declared in 1900 that even the loss of India's old industries was partly due to the drain. To quote him, "Great Britain had deprived them of their life-blood and they could no longer carry on their industries because they had no means wherewith to maintain them."

The view of G. V. Joshi was that the insufficiency of working capital available in India for industrial purposes was partly due to the absence of any large accumulation of capital which was partly the result of the drain of capital from India to Britain. To quote him, "No nation can stand such a drain and yet hold its own in the industrial field."

The view of D. E. Wacha was that as capital accumulates capital and industry is limited by capital, India could not embark on new industrial enterprises so long as her capital was being drained to England. A similar view was expressed by G. K. Gokhale before the Welby Commission Gokhale told the Commission that the growth of industries in India was handicapped because India's capital was carried away to England.

It is pointed out that the Indian leaders were oblivious of the fact that the net national surplus could not be transformed into industrial capital automatically and there were two hurdles in the way. They ignored the internal drain on the national capital caused by the conspicuous consumption of the saving classes and by their tendency to hoard wealth or to invest it in non-industrial and non-productive fields. They also did not realise the fact that the problems pertaining to technique, organisation of capital, entrepreneurial skill etc. had to be overcome before economic surplus could be transformed into industrial capital. In the context of the drain, these problems were relegated to the background. Dadabhai completely ignored them. His view was that the stopping of the drain and the crea-

tion of capital thereby was the primary task and the other problems could be faced only after the same had been accomplished.

The view of Dadabhai Naoroji was that the drain facilitated the penetration and exploitation of India by foreign capital. By preventing the accumulation of capital within India and by thus prostrating internal capital, the drain permitted the foreign capitalists to come to India without having to face any indigenous competition and thereby to monopolise and reap all the advantages of India's material resources. Moreover, the drain acted as the chief source of accumulation of foreign capital invested in India as a large part of the drain was brought back to India as foreign capital. In this respect, the European services in India acted as a double evil. They prevented the accumulation of capital in the hands of the Indian salaried classes and promoted the growth of foreign capital through the savings of European officials who patronised and protected British capitalists.

R. C. Dutt was of the view that the drain was mainly paid out of land revenue and therefore represented the impoverishment of the peasantry of India. He pointed out that in 1900-1, the Home Charges nearly equalled the total land revenue. He also maintained that financially the drain was met directly from the public revenues whose largest constituent was land revenue. Economically, the drain had to take the form of excess exports. The cultivators had to sell a large part of their produce to pay land revenue or rent. That produce was exported because the country had to create the requisite export surplus. The agricultural products extorted from the village by the harsh land revenue system had to be marketed. Through the mechanism of land revenue the peasant was forced to pay for the drain and to provide the agricultural products through which it was remitted abroad. On the one hand, he was impoverished by the heavy and harsh land revenue and on the other, he was starved of foodgrains which he was compelled to sell and the country to export because of the dual pressure of land revenue and the drain. R. C. Dutt maintained that "the annual economic drain will never be reduced until the land tax is moderated and the land tax will never be moderated until the economic drain is reduced."

The view of D. E. Wacha was that the economic drain deprived agriculture of all productive capital. No increase in the produce of the soil can take place as long as "the profits of the entire population are drained away". Such an increase was "only possible by the expenditure everywhere of capital on the land, in minute fractions, doubtless in each case, but in large masses in the aggregate."

Another view was that the economic drain worsened India's terms of trade with foreign countries. As the drain involved the maintenance of an export surplus, it gave a compulsory character to India's exports. India had either to export or perish. The result was that India had to lower the price level of her exports to persuade the foreign purchasers to buy them. India got so little for her exports.

Even a man like Dadabhai admitted that there had to be some drain on account of the foreign rule in the country. That drain could end only when India became free. As that was not possible, then, efforts were made to get the same reduced. Dadabhai and R. C. Dutt tried to convince the

British people that the curtailment of the drain would result in immense benefit to them by increasing their exports to India. They also appealed to the working class of Britain by pointing out that the economic drain from India was benefitting only some people of the higher classes and if the drain was removed, there would be a big market in India for British goods and the workers of Britain would gain thereby. Many suggestions were given to reduce the drain. One was to Indianise the civil and military services and thereby reduce the European element to a reasonable proportion. The Indian leaders also demanded that the Home Charges should be reduced. Britain should take a large share of that burden. The burden of the interest payments on India's public debt could be reduced by reducing the burden of the public debt itself and by reducing the rate of interest on it by obtaining an imperial guarantee for it. The burden of railway debt could be reduced by cutting down the speed of railway construction. The stores for the Government of India could be purchased in India and not from England. A check could be put on the import of private foreign capital.

It is not correct to say that Ranade was a critic of the drain theory. As a matter of fact, he was one of the first persons in India to propagate the drain theory as early as 1872. In 1874, he condemned the foreign rule in India as it involved the economic drain of wealth and talents from the country. In 1881, the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha which was dominated by Ranade pointed out that the Indians were agitated over the question of drain represented by the excess of exports over imports and how the same could be stopped. G. V. Joshi and G. K. Gokhale also held the view that the drain hindered industrial development and impoverished the people. However, Ranade, Joshi, Gokhale and many other Indian leaders did not favour the idea of making the drain the central question of Indian politics or of nationalist propaganda and agitation. They would have preferred to shelve the question for some time. In this aspect they differed from Dadabhai who put all the emphasis on the economic drain from India and the necessity of stopping or reducing it.

Critics of Drain Theory

If there were advocates of the drain theory, there were also its opponents. The drain theory was attacked by the official and non-official spokesmen, advisers and defenders of the British regime in India. They tried to point out that the nationalist attack on the drain was due to their ignorance and lack of a proper understanding of the economic issues involved in the matter. In 1878, John Strachey pointed out that India's "connection with England and the financial results of that connection, compel her to send to Europe every year about 20 millions sterling worth of her products without receiving in return any direct commercial equivalent. It is this excess of exports over imports which, in the language of the economists, is described as tribute." Theodore Morison in his book "The Economic Transition in India" and Knowles in his book "The Economic Development of the British Overseas Empire" criticised the drain theory. The same was the case with Vera Anstey. These critics pointed out that the Indians overrated and exaggerated the drain and failed to make the necessary deductions. They did not take into account the fact that a part of the ex-

port surplus was accounted for by the invisible imports like shipping services, insurance charges on imports and exports and expenditure incurred by Indian students and travellers abroad. The transactions on capital account also tended to falsify the relative weight of imports and exports. While calculating the figure for export surplus, the heavy imports of gold and silver should also be taken into account. Moreover, India received adequate economic equivalents for the excess exports. The biggest part of the drain was due to the interest on borrowed capital which represented economic development and enrichment of India and not its impoverishment. With the assistance of foreign capital, railways were constructed, irrigation was developed and plantation and other industrial enterprises were started and developed, all of which earned profits, and only a small part of it was sent out of the country as interest. In addition to earning profits, these enterprises increased national income. Even when all profits were taken out of the country, the wages and rent remained in India. India's political connection with England enabled her to borrow in the cheapest market in the world. So far as the unproductive debt of India was concerned, it was very small as compared with the un-productive debts of other countries. It was also pointed out that the Home Charges were not large. India received in return the services of hard working, selfless and efficient British officials and non-economic welfare in the form of peace and order, a modern administration and security against external aggression.

The reply of the Indian leaders was that if a particular service was useful and could be acquired through expenditure abroad, they were willing to bear the drain on that account, but if the service was useless or even if useful could be had within India itself, the drain on that account was objectionable. They also pointed out that foreign capital was not essential. The need for foreign capital arose because India's own capital had been and was being drained out by her rulers. In the absence of that drain, India might have herself financed railways etc. and met her own requirements of capital. In fact, foreign capital replaced and not augmented India's own capital. If foreign capital had been a genuine addition to indigenous capital, it might have been welcomed. Foreign capital imported into India was India's own capital drained earlier. Hence, there was no genuine foreign capital investment in India.

The Indian leaders also pointed out that foreign capital was not as beneficial as was made out by its supporters. The railways were not an unmixed blessing. All the money spent on railways was not essential. The public debt contracted for the construction of those railways which were superfluous was neither useful nor essential. Private foreign capital carried away not only interest but also all the profits of enterprise, leaving India without any secondary benefits of capital reinvestment. The railways did not yield any profit till the end of the nineteenth century. In view of the miserable conditions of work and the low wages paid to the Indians in foreign enterprises, the benefit to India was very little. Moreover, foreign capital was injurious to the country as it suppressed indigenous capital and prevented its useful employment by tending to monopolise the industrial field. Foreign capital stood for exploitation and impoverishment of India and not for her development and enrichment. The foreign loans were not needed at all and were not generally usefully employed. As they were nothing but India's own drained capital, the question of their cheapness, did not

arise. Even if higher interest was paid on loans raised in India, that interest would have remained and fructified within the country.

The Indian leaders also pointed out that a part of Indian public debt was entirely political in nature and useless, inessential and unproductive in character. There was no economic equivalent in return for it. India had to pay for the costs of the Afghan War of 1878, the Egyptian Wars, the Burmese War and the Frontier Wars of the 1890's. A large part of the Indian public debt was not a business debt and therefore not morally due from India and the cost of its servicing was an obvious drain of wealth.

As regards the money spent on the employment of Europeans in the Government of India, the reply of the Indian leaders was that their services were not essential to India and were in fact not needed by it since those could be performed equally well and more cheaply by the Indians themselves. Payments for their services were compulsory and in the nature of an imposition and represented a drain. A large part of the military and civil services of the Government of India were maintained not for the benefit of India but to serve the imperial interests of Great Britain. Any expenditure on those services was clearly a drain.

As regards the non-economic benefits enjoyed by the Indians from the employment of British citizens, the Indian leaders pointed to the non-economic losses such as the moral loss, the loss of wisdom and experience and the stunting and emasculation of the people of India. G. K. Gokhale drew attention to this fact in his evidence before the Welby Commission in 1897 in these words: "The excessive costlines of the foreign agency is not, however, its only evil. There is a moral evil which, if anything, is even greater. A kind of dwarfing or stunting of the Indian race is going on under the present system. We must live all the days of our life in an atmosphere of inferiority and the tallest of us must bend, in order that the exigencies of the existing system may be satisfied. The upward impulse, if I may use such an expression, which every school boy at Eton or Harrow may feel, that he may one day be a Gladstone, a Nelson, or a Wellington, and which may draw forth the best efforts of which he is capable, is denied to us. The full height to which our manhood is capable of rising can never be reached by us under the present system. The moral elevation which every self-governing people feel cannot be felt by us. Our administration and military talents must gradually disappear, owing to sheer disuse, till at last our lot, as hewers of wood and drawers of water in our own country, is stereotyped."

The drain theory as advocated by the Indian leaders was not an isolated criticism. It was a part of their assessment of the official policies towards industry, railway, foreign trade, foreign capital, currency and exchange, land revenue, labour and taxation and expenditure. Dadabhai Naoroji, R. C. Dutt and the nationalist newspapers in India used the drain theory to bring into focus the entire nationalist criticism of the official economic policies and to bring to light the exploitative character of the British rule in India. This theory was the anvil on which the hammer of Indian nationalism was to strike with all its concentrated energy.

Implications of Drain Theory

The drain theory enabled the Indians to arrive at the chief contradiction between the Indian people and British imperialism. This theory ultimately

moulded the political outlook of Dadabhai Naoroji. The very definition of the drain and the theory of its causation led Dadabhai to deny that it was the consequence and accompaniment of India's economic backwardness and to assert that it was all due to the fact that India was being ruled by a foreign power. In his book "The Poverty of India", Dadabhai put stress on the fact that Britain was able to keep back a large part of India's exports chiefly because of "the political position it holds over India." In his letter to Lord Welby written in 1896, Dadabhai put emphasis on the fact that the drain was "no simple matter of business to us" but was simply the result of "unnatural administration and management of expenditure" of India's resources by a foreign country. So far as the Home Charges were concerned, those were "forced upon India by sheer tyranny and without any voice or consent of India." In 1897, Dadabhai pointed out that "the inherent and essential defect" of British rule in India was the financial, political and intellectual drain. In due course of time, Dadabhai came to realise the nature and purposes of the British rule in India. While recognising the British rule as Providential, he began to speak in a different language while dealing with the drain. Slowely and almost against his own wishes, he began to feel and say publicly that the beneficial, benevolent and philanthropic nature of British rule in India was in reality a myth. The responsibility for the lack of industrial growth and the poverty of the people of India was due to the economic drain from the country. He denied that the other supposed benefits of British rule were of any avail to Indian people when accompanied by the drain. In 1880, he held the British rulers of India mainly responsible for the famines in the country. He asserted that it was "the drain of India's wealth by them that lays at their door the dreadful results of misery, starvation and deaths of millions." Dadabhai also pointed out that India did not derive any real benefit from the security that British rule provided against external aggression for "the English rulers stand sentinel at the front door of India, challenging the whole world, that they do and shall protect India against all comers, and themselves carry away by a backdoor the very treasure they stand sentinel to protect." Far from protecting the country, British rule was "an everlasting, increasing and every day increasing foreign invasion" that was "utterly, though gradually, destroying the country". In the words of Dadabhai, "England was the worst invader she has had the misfortune to have". To quote Dadabhai, "India does not enjoy security of property and life, and also, moreover, of knowledge or wisdom. To millions in India, life is simply half-feeding or starvation, or famines and disease." Again, "The way you secure life and property is by protecting it from open violence by anybody else, taking care that you yourself should take away that property. The security of life, were it not a tragic subject, would be a very funny one. Look at the millions that are suffering day by day, year after year, even in years of good harvest."

The drain theory had a deep impact on the understanding of Dadabhai regarding the nature and character of British rule in India. According to him, owing to the drain, "the whole rule moves in a wrong unnatural and suicidal groove." In 1895, he declared in the House of Commons that "British India was indeed British India and not India's India." Again, in a way, a great mass of the Indians were worse off than the slaves of the Southern States. The slaves worked on their masters' land and resources and the masters took the profits. Indians have to work on their own land and

resources and hand over the profits to the foreign masters." Dadabhai wrote to Lord Welby in 1897, "The (British people) call us fellow citizens and they must make their word a reality, instead of what it is at present, an untruth and a romance—simply a relationship of slave-holder and slave." Dadabhai also maintained that beneficence was a mask behind which exploitation of India was carried on by the British though "un-accompanied with any open compulsion or violence to person or property which the world can see and be horrified with." He asserted that "under the present evil and unrighteous administration of the Indian expenditure, the romance is the beneficence of the British rule, the reality is the 'bleeding' of the British rule."

By 1904, Dadabhai had very harsh word to speak about the British rule in India. He called that rule "barbaric". He gave up the traditional nationalist belief that everything that went wrong in India was the fault of the British officials in India who were selfish and who perverted the wishes of the Home authorities. In 1897, he put emphasis not on the evil working of the officials but on the evil machinery or system of Government in India which produced the drain. This led him on to the road of political militancy. It is rightly said that Dadabhai who had started his political career with the most moderate of political demands became slowly year by year and degree by degree, more and more extreme in his politics and political demands. He began to refer to the European employees of the Government of India as "leeches". In 1885, he demanded that only the highest power of control and supervision should remain in English hands and all other services should be manned by Indians. In 1897, he demanded that only the Viceroy, the Governors and the Lieutenant-Governors should be Englishmen.

Dadabhai changed his attitude towards the British Government gradually. He started by giving warnings of dire consequences if the drain was not checked. Those warnings were transformed into direct political slogans and demands. In 1880, he cautioned the British against comparing themselves with the past rulers of India. To quote him, "If the British do not show themselves to be vastly superior in proportion to their superior enlightenment and civilisation, if India does not prosper and progress under them far more largely, there will be no justification for their existence in India." Dadabhai pointed out that the past drain might be forgotten and forgiven as a misfortune but the drain in future would "be deliberate plunder and destruction." In 1896, Dadabhai stated that though the people of India had still faith in the sense of justice of the British people, "the result of the present system would be to make the Indians to come to the conclusion that the Indians shall never have any chance except by their getting rid in the first instance of their European rulers." If the drain continued, the people would yearn "to get rid of their European rulers." Dadabhai wrote to Lord Welby, "Is it possible for any sane man to think that any one nation can hold another in slavery and yet expect loyal devotion and attachment from it? It is not nature, not human nature. It has never happened and will never happen." In 1900, Dadabhai warned the British Government that the Indians had put up with their exploitation for so long and it would be wrong to believe that their "loyalty cannot fail, that it will continue in the same condition as at present.'" The Indian

people "were now beginning to understand the position and might be tempted, unless something was done to ameliorate their condition, to use force in order to destroy force." In his speech on the drain at the International Socialist Congress, Dadabhai declared: "The remedy was to give India self-Government. She should be treated like other British colonies. The Indians would maintain their connection with England, but they resented being treated as slaves. They demanded the right to govern themselves and to share in the general progress made by the nations of the earth." In his message to the Banaras session of the Indian National Congress held in 1905, Dadabhai wrote, "Without self-Government the Indians can never get rid of their present drain and the consequent impoverishment, misery and destruction. No palliative of any kind whatever, no mere alteration and tinkering of the mechanical machinery of administration, can and will do any good at all. The drain can only be stopped by the Government, by the people themselves. Self-Government is the only remedy for India's woes and wrongs." In his Presidential Address to the Calcutta session of the Indian National Congress held in 1906, Dadabhai declared that all the demands of the Indian people could be summed up in one word "Swaraj" or "Self-Government" like that of the United Kongdom or the colonies.

Dr. Bipan Chandra rightly points out that "The central difference between the political consequences of the drain theory and those of all the other theories of India's poverty lay in the fact that while the latter could to some extent and for some time be reconciled with the existence of foreign rule, the drain theory could not be." (The Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India, p. 698). This point could be illustrated by referring to the "industry theory" which held that the lack of industrial development in the country resulted in the poverty of the people. Some industrial growth could occur even under the existing political and economic conditions. There was no inherent and total compulsion to link the struggle for industry with the struggle for self-Government. Political freedom was not one of the minimal conditions for the growth of Indian industry. Even an extreme critic of the land revenue policy of the Government could be satisfied by reduction in land revenue and by checking its future growth. Criticism of railways as cause of India's poverty was slowly corroded by their increasing usefulness and profitability. Even extremism arising out of demands for national political advancement could be moderated by giving carefully calculated doses of political concessions and reforms.

What Dadabhai wanted was that the Indians should concentrate on the drain theory as the cause of their poverty in order to bring about positive results. He warned R. C. Dutt in 1903 that his emphasis on the defects in the land revenue system was likely to "divert attention from the fundamental cause of Indian poverty—the drain—and its remeedy, self-Government." The Amrit Bazar Patrika also maintained that by laying emphasis on the land revenue, R. C. Dutt was "raising a side issue and would find himself lost in a labyrinth of discussion. What is necessary to do is to raise clear issues and stand upon firm footing to be able to bring the matter home." The drain theory traced the origins of the economic evils from which India was suffering to British rule itself and emphasized its exploitative character. The drain was entirely the fault of Britain and the British must bear the entire blame for the poverty of India arising out of it. The Indian people and their leaders could do nothing to reduce the drain. They could

merely agitate for its abolition. However, India could make no economic progress as long as drain continued. Thus drain was synoymous with British rule. The theory set out in acute problem which cut at the very roots of British rule in India. Even political reforms could not satisfy the exponents of the drain theory as reforms could not by themselves reduce the drain. Political militancy based on the drain theory could not be lessened even by political reforms.

The drain theory was revolutionary in its political implications. It brought the question of political power to the centre of the stage. It helped to politicalise the public life of India by raising economic issues to a political level. It tended to replace political passivity by political action. No other idea could arouse the people of India more than the thought that they were being taxed so that the Englishmen may live in comfort. The drain theory became the rallying cry of a nation of peasants. The theory had not to be proved by sophisticated and complex arguments. It was self-evident. The feeling gained ground among the people that their country which was full of gold at one time was drained slowly of all her wealth, thus rendering the people poor and destitute.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Bipan Chandra : *The Rise and Growth of Economic Nationalism in India*, New Delhi, 1982.

Damle, P.R. : *Gopal Krishna Gokhale*, Poona, 1961.

Deogirikar, T.R. : *Gopal Krishna Gokhale*, New Delhi, 1964.

Dutt, R.C. : *The Economic History of India*, 2 Vols., Delhi, 1960 Edition.

Dutt, R.C. : *The Peasantry of Bengal*, Calcutta, 1874.

Dutt, R.C. : *England and India*, London, 1897.

Gokhale, Gopal Krishna : *Speeches*, 3rd Edn., Natesan & Co., Madras, 1929.

Gupta, Atulchandra : *Life and Work of R.C. Dutt.*

Gupta, J.N. : *Life and Work of Romesh Chandra Dutt*, London, 1911.

Kale, V.G. : *Gokhale and Economic Reforms*, Poona, 1916.

Knowles, I.C.A. : *The Economic Development of the British Overseas Empire*, London, 1928.

Masani, R.P. : *Dadabhai Naoroji : The Grand Old Man of India*, London, 1939.

Morison, Theodore : *The Economic Transition in India*, 1911.

Naoroj, Dadabhai : *Poverty and Un-British Rule in India*, London, 1901.

Naoroji, Dadabhai : *Poverty of India*, 1876.

Naoroji Papers : Danabhai Naoroji Memorial Trust, Bombay.

Parvate, T.V. : *Mahadeo Govind Ranade*, Asia Publishing House, 1963.

Ranade, M.G. : *Essays on Indian Economics*, Bombay, 1899.

Shirras, G. Findlay : *Poverty and Kindred Economic Problems in India*, Government of India, 1935.

CHAPTER XIV

Social Reform Versus Political Reform

About the middle of the eighties of the nineteenth century, a great controversy arose regarding the relative importance of social reform vis-a-vis political reform. An acute and even acrimonious controversy whether political reform should precede or follow social and religious reconstruction, was often carried on in the press and on the platform in all the Presidentcy towns and both the high and the low took keen interest in it.

Telang

Perhaps the most balanced view on the subject was that of Kashinath Trimbak Telang (1853-93), a judge of the High Court of Bombay. In an address before the Students' Literary and Scientific Society, Bombay in February 1886, Telang observed that political and social questions were so intertwined with each other that a hard and fast line could not in practice be drawn between them. Even if preference could be given to social reform over political reform, it would not be feasible to enforce it in practice. For example, education is an agency of vital importance alike for political and social progress. The question of infant marriage is primarily a social one, but the modes suggested for changing such a custom raise important political issues, touching the relation of social legislation and the extent of Government intervention in this field.

Telang referred to two grounds which were being put forward in favour of the preference to be given to social reforms over political reforms. One ground was that slavery in the home was incompatible with a belief in the freedom of the individual to think, express himself and act in his own may, unfettered by tradition and custom. The second ground was that social customs which were unjust to certain groups in society could impede the development of social institutions for political expression. The reply of Telang was that slavery in the home was incompatible with liberty. However, he pointed out that for the application of the principle, "you must have a conscious tyranny on the one side and a slavery that is felt to be slavery on the other. Without this consciousness on both sides, I hold that the principle would be incorrect." Taking the case of India, Telang asked, "Have we in truth got to deal with a case of conscious tyranny and felt slavery? I say, certainly not. I say that so far as we have tyranny and slavery in the case, we have only a case of tyranny of the past, the present being bound in slavery to it. It is not, as it is often represented, a case of male tyrants and female slaves to any notable extent. Thus as regards such questions as infant marriage and enforced widowhood, the women who were supposed to be slaves to men were really in many respects their masters. You talk of the duty which lies upon us of breaking the shackles off their feet, but they will have none of this breaking off the shackles. To

a great extent they do not feel the shackles and they decline to let us break them. They protest against the interference with and desecration of their ancient and venerable traditions which, from their point of view, is involved in this course of enfranchisement. Therefore, I hold that the phrase 'household slavery' as used in this controversy is an entire misnomer."

Telang did not agree with the proposition that a nation with unresonable social customs could not be well organised for political expression. He pointed out that historical evidence was against it. Citing the example of the history of England in the latter half of the nineteenth century, Telang felt that though there were "social evils, huge and serious social evils awaiting remedy", notable political progress by way of widened suffrage granted by the Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867 was achieved and social reform did not receive equal attention.

The contribution of Telang to the thinking on the subject of social reform versus political reform, was the *principle of expediency* which he stated in these words: "Reform ought to go along the line of least resistance. Secure first the reform which you can secure with the least difficulty and then turn your energies in the direction of those reforms where more difficulty has to be encountered." Applying the Spencerian idea that the sentiment which induces resistance to the despotism of rulers, likewise induces resistance to the pressure of world opinion, Telang thought that the strength of the movement for self-Government would show itself in pressing for changes in certain social customs on specific issues. The vigour which the spirit of reform would derive from success, would enable those working for self-Government to achieve success in every field more promptly than by working in any other way.

If the principle of the line of least resistance was accepted, then it was simply a question comparing the opposing forces in the field of social reform and in the field of political reform and applying the principle to the circumstances in India. To quote him, "What are the forces opposed to us, if I may use that compendious expression? On the one side, we have a Government by a progressive nation which is a benign mother of free nations—a nation which, by its constituted authorities, has solemly and repeatedly declared and in some measure practically shown the sincerity of its declarations, that it is ready to admit us to full political rights, when we show that we deserve them and shall use them well. On the other side, we have an ancient nation, subject to strong prejudices, not in anything like full sympathy with the new conditions now existing in the country; attached, perhaps not wisely but too well, to its unreligious notions with which the proposed social reforms are closely, intimately and at numberless points intertwined; loving all its own genuine hoary traditions and some of its very modern ones also which it supposes to be hoary—yet often failing to understand the true meaning and significance of both classes of tradition. As between these two groups of what I have called, only for convenience of phrase, opposing forces, can there be any reasonable doubts how the line of least resistance runs? If we compare the Government and the Hindu population to two forts facing the army of reform, can there be any doubt that the wisest course for that army is to turn its energies first towards the fort represented by the Government, where we have numerous and powerful

friends among the garrison, and which is held against us only in order to test whether we shall be able to properly use any larger powers that may be conceded to us there? As to the other fort, the case is as far as possible from being one of *veni vidi vici*. The soldiers of old garrison are not in the least ready to give up, and in some respects we have yet got even to forge, and to learn to wield, the weapons by which we have to fight them."

In the background of the above-mentioned facts, the view of Telang was that more energy should be devoted to political than to social reform. Another argument in its favour was that in political matters, unity between the Hindus, Muslims and Parsis and among the people of Eastern, Southern, Western and Northern India was possible. However, in the field of social reform, such unity was inconceivable as the social evils differed from community to community and from region to region and therefore the remedy suggested also differed. Under the circumstances, it was wise to attempt to make changes first in the political field in which co-operation was possible and use the fraternal feeling so generated to tackle social evils. Telang concluded, "It is not possible to sever political from social reform altogether. The two must go hand in hand. We must and ought to devote the greater portion of our energy to political reform, but so as still to keep alive a warm sympathy for social reform."

View of the Hindu

The Hindu of Madras expressed similar views in its issue of 14 January 1891: "By giving prominence to such social problems, it (Congress) would run no risk of narrowing its national character. It would not repel politicians and it would attract many who are not primarily politicians. It would incur no decrease in the consideration shown to its opinions either here or in England. On the contrary, it would supply an additional guarantee of the genuineness of its aims; and no one who has followed Mr. Malabari's success can doubt that its acceptance in England as a political factor in India, would be furthered. The question, however, as to whether a national Congress should interest itself in social progress is not entirely a question of convenience. It is one that will ultimately have to be decided on grounds of moral duty and historical necessity, and the time for the decision cannot be far distant." Again, "It is comparatively easy to demolish the Anglo-Indian Government and ask our rulers to carry on the administration on the lines suggested by them. The responsibility of working the change is not theirs, and the task of political reform, so far as the Congress leaders are concerned, is attended with little difficulty. Not so the task of social reform. The burden of giving effect to the alterations that we might suggest is ours. The foreign rulers have nothing to do with them. The social reformer has, therefore, a more serious and difficult contest before him than the political reformer. If it is this increased responsibility that scares educated men away from social problems, they will hardly receive credit for courage."

Henry Cotton

It is pointed out that Telang and Henry Cotton had similar views on the subject. To quote Cotton, "If political reform is thus secured by the concerted action of all the educated classes in India, that must and inevitably tell favourably on the advancement of social progress."

Ranade

Justice Ranade also put emphasis on the inter-dependence between social and political progress. His view was that social and political matters could not be separated. There could not be a good social system when the people were low in the scale of political rights. Likewise, the people could not be fit to exercise political rights and privileges unless their social system was based on reason and justice. It was a mistaken view which divorced political considerations from social and economic considerations. No man could be said to realise his duty in one aspect who neglected his duties in the other directions. Addressing the National Social Conference, he observed, "When we meet at these annual gatherings to seek our political elevation, we must not lose sight of the fact that our social emancipation should go along with it, if we desire to be an individual consistent whole, with a just balance of power in all our movements. In other words, the social evolution must take place side by side, if it should not precede, the political growth that we desire to achieve."

Tilak

Tilak was as much in favour of social reform as Agarkar was. His view was that it was wiser to attack the foreign rule and concentrate upon capturing political power and use it as a means for bringing about social reform and all other reforms. Tilak was in favour of dealing patiently with his people, but in dealing with the foreign Government, he assumed the role of a discontented impatient agitator. Parvate, his biographer, writes about Tilak, "Awakening of political consciousness among the people and capture of political power for using it as an instrument for whatever reforms were necessary had a decisive preference and an undoubted priority in his scheme of things." While addressing the Maharashtra Social Conference held at Nasik in May 1917, Tilak said, "Because I am unable to attend a Conference you must not imagine that I have no sympathy for the cause. One man alone cannot attend to all efforts although he may desire to do so. I act on the principle of division of work."

M. R. Jayakar

Regarding the relation between political and social reform, the view of M. R. Jayakar was that many evils in Hindu society had been aggravated largely owing to the political conditions in which the Hindus had to live. Caste distinctions became so marked and race conflict so frequent among the Indians because of their having had to live for several decades a cramped life. Their political life afforded few opportunities of united action in the defence or protection of the country. There were few occasions when appeal could be made to higher patriotism for subordinating class prejudices to feelings of mutual trust and dependence in the face of a common pursuit or danger. To quote him, "Under self-Government many occasions arise which necessitate the urge of the higher calls of patriotism and provide a fertile germ of social unification. But owing to our dependence and deprivation of self-Government, we find in India not the free environment which fosters social unity. Those who advocate the cause of self-Government as being the open sesame to many wonderful opportunities of social cohesion, appear, so far at least as this aspect of the question is concerned, to see more clearly than their rivals who ignore altogether the

importance of political freedom as contributing to the development of social aggregation and solidarity".

The view of Jayakar was that social and political reforms could not be put into two water-right compartments nor any frontiers could be set up betwen them. Those who set up an opposition between these two departments of national activity or regarded them as subject to a psychological or historic sequence were on wrong lines. It was not correct to say that in order to be politicially great, a nation must be socially perfect. It was also not correct that the grant of political autonomy would automatically prove a panacea for social evils. Jayakar discarded both of these views as extreme ones and equally inadequate to express the truth which lay between them. The same qualities were involved in political as in social endeavour and a nation which aimed at greatness in one sphere could not succeed without developing the same forces in the other sphere. To quote Jayakar, "Social reform without political reform is futile; and political freedom without the leaven of social purity and justice, is race or communal aggrandisement. If the role of a European Collector is galling because it is unsympathetic, that of a Brahman or Prabhu in power may be more so, if sympathy and humanity have not superseded caste or racial hauteur. We, therefore, are more zealous social reformers because we yield to none in our desire to obtain political privileges fast and widely; nay we fail to understand if we may be permitted to say so in all candour, how anybody can achieve political progress and at the same time oppose the march of social equality."

Sri Aurobindo

The view of Sri Aurobindo that in a country subject to alien rule, no effective reform in social affairs, education, economic development etc. was possible until there was self-rule and the people had their own Government. According to him, the first want of a subject people was access to political power without which it could neither produce creative minds nor rid society of untenable customs such as slavery, early marriage, untouchability etc. In an article entitled "The One Thing Needful" published in 1908 in the *Bande Mataram,* Sri Aurobindo wrote, "Society lives by the proper harmony of its parts and bases that harmony on the centre of power in which the whole community cannot be healthy. If the state is foreign and inorganic, the community cannot live an organic life. If the state be hostile, the community is doomed. No great work can be done by a community which is diseased at or deprived of its centre. *The hope of social reform divorced from political reform is an illogical hope* which ignores the nature of social life and the conditions of its well-being. All expectation of moral regeneration which leaves freedom out of the count, is a dream. First freedom, then regeneration." Sri Aurobindo advanced two additional arguments why the political reform should take precedence over social reform. Negatively, no attempt to effect social reform for its own sake has any chance of success because it will at once reawaken the old bitter struggle between the past and the present which baffled the efforts of the reformers. Positively, the political resurgence of the nation involves and necessitates a regeneration of the society by the great change of spirit and environment which it will bring about.

N. N. Sen

Speaking at a meeting of the National Social Conference at Allahabad in 1888, N. N. Sen said, "No movement could succeed without self-help and cooperation. They had yet to learn their value. The Indian National Congress was the outcome of an important movement. But although political associations were springing up plentifully, social reform associations were at a discount. Yet social and political reforms were closely allied and no progress was possible unless they became great socially, morally and religiously." Although N. N. Sen was himself engaged in politics, he had his heart in social reforms. His view was that until women were uplifted, no progress was possible. Hence, the first essential was greater progress in female education than what had been achieved so far.

S. N. Banerjea

Surendranath Banerjea was opposed to Government interference in the social field. His view was that social reform must come from within. He also held the view that political enfranchisement was impossible without the enfranchisement of women. The two went hand in hand and a nation that was politically great, could not be socially inferior.

The view of Shrimati Hardevi Roshanlal, Editor of the *Bharat Bhagini*, was that the National Social Conference was even more important than the Indian National Congress. By the Indian National Congress, the people hoped to get justice from the Government. By the National Social Conference, they bettered their social conditions. The justice which people expected at the hands of the British Government, ought to dispose them to do justice to those whose happiness and misery, joy and sorrow were so intermixed with those of theirs. It is well said:

"The Woman's cause is man's
They rise or sink together,
Dwarfed, or god-like, bond or free"

B. M. Malabari

B. M. Malabari (1853-1912) was a social reformer. In his paper *The Indian Spectator*, Malabari advocated exclusive attention to social reform and belittled the importance of political reform or reforms in other fields. According to him, the crux of the Indian problem was the social one. The marriage system was the problem of problems. The many ills from which the country suffered could be removed only by the improvement of the marriage system. Her arts, science, industries, commerce and agriculture were all stamped with the mark of her social life of premature development, arrested growth and early decay. Her politics also would be stamped with the same mark. To quote him, "The public life of a nation is but the elaboration of its family life. Where the latter is overshadowed by the presence of the child-wife struggling with premature maternity, the spectre of the child-widow struggling with life-long penitentiary widowhood, it is idle to expect justice, equality, freedom or independence in the sphere of public affairs; idle, likewise, to expect due appreciation of these qualities in others. The one must react upon the other."

It is pointed out that although Dadabhai Naoroji had begun his life as a champion of social reform, he considered the attitude of Malabari so

much one-sided that he wrote to him on 15 December 1887 that no people who were politically debased would ever be and had been socially high. It was the political elevation which in his opinion would give that backbone and stamina, that manliness which would give strength and courage to carry social reforms. In the same letter, Dadabhai asked Malabari to do what he could for the advancement of social reform but requested him not to unnecessarily discredit and discourage other important movements.

Although the majority of the Congressmen were sympathetic towards social reform, Malabari continued to ridicule the attitude of those Congressmen who did not wish to touch social questions on account of their fear of a split in their camp. He found a wide gulf between the professions and practice of Congress gentlemen and the Shastric Pandits. He was surprised that the Congressmen who smelt danger in the social question, advocated temperance which was a social problem. While they opposed it in other respects, they advocated Government action in the field of temperance. The view of Malabari was that the state could bring relief in all cases. Malabari could not understand the logic of Manmohan Ghose, an active member of the Congress and the Chairman of the Reception Committee of the Congress session held at Calcutta in 1890, who observed at the Congress meeting in 1890 that before effecting the social reform, the people should be educated.

Malabari did not agree with the view that the Congress was a composite body and hence questions affecting the Hindus alone should not be discussed there, but should be discussed at a separate Hindu Social Conference. Malabari pointed out that the pillars of the Congress attached no importance to social questions, though they were polite enough to express verbal sympathy from a distance. To quote him, "Far be it for us to decry political progress. We say it is essential, it is inevitable, placed as we are under a nation loving freedom and progress. What we object to is this political monopoly that is sought, we believe unconsciously, to be established in India." It was for this reason that the Congress did not vote for the Age of Consent Bill.

The political views of Malabari and his party were very moderate, even when those were judged by the political standards of those days. The Indian Spectator wrote that a few monopolists advocated the withdrawal of British rule in India in their favour towards the end of the nineteenth century. However, neither the Shastras nor history could be made to invite such an impossible and undesirable event. If India parted with England, she would part with her good Providence, though a gradual readjustment of the relations of the two must take place in various matters with the growth of knowledge and sympathy. The monopolists were themselves so much conscious of this necessity that if the British were to threaten to retire the next year, these misguided men would be the first to go on their knees and implore them to remain. Of all the classes in India, it is the monopolists who wanted a strong power to safeguard their interests.

The view of Malabari was that the very fact of the subjection of the Indian people to invader after invader indicated that they were incapable of governing themselves, that there was something radically wrong in the organisation of their society that made them fall an easy prey to anarchy and chaos and to subjection by foreigners. Before any pretension could

be reasonably put forward for new political privileges, the inherent defect must be traced and rooted out.

It is pointed out that this extremism on the part of Malabari aroused extremism in the ranks of those who stood for political reform first as the key to all other reforms.

Vivekananda

Swami Vivekananda had little in common with the social reformers and he seldom indulged in political talks. However, he was for the amelioration of social evils which stood in the way of the people attaining true freedom. His call to his countrymen was that India was to be raised, the poor were to be fed, education was to be spread and the evil of priestcraft was to be removed. He wanted the end of priestcraft and social tyranny and demanded more bread and more opportunity for everybody. He ridiculed the young Indians organising meetings to demand more power from the British. He used to say that none deserved liberty who was not prepared to give liberty. If the English gave over to the Indians all the powers, then the powers that be would hold the people down and would not let them have it, because slaves wanted power to make only slaves.

Tagore

The view of Rabindranath Tagore was that the problem before the country was to remove those social customs and ideals which generated a want of self-respect and a complete dependence on those above. This state of affairs had been brought about by the caste system. The blind and lazy habit of relying upon the authority of traditions was an anachronism in the present age. He deplored the fact that a majority of the naionalists did not realise the importance of social reform and constructive work. The creed of Indian nationalism was that the Indian social system had been perfected for all time to come by their ancestors and their only task was to build political miracle of freedom upon the quicksand of social slavery. The view of Tagore was that on account of conservatism in social justice, the basis of nationalism was wanting in India and there was no common birthright. Tagore was convinced that tyrannical social restrictions would only add to the inevitable lies and hypocrisy in political life.

Ambedkar

In the course of an Address delivered on 18 January 1943, Dr. B. R. Ambedkar (1893-1956) characterised the conflict between the Social Reformers and the Politicals as one between two opposing points of view and it centrred round the question, "which is more important for the survival of a nation, political freedom or strong moral fibre?" He supported the view of Ranade that moral stamina was more important than political freedom. Without the will, the energy and the courage to try to modify or change those social customs that hinder the implementation of new policies, there could be no attainment of national political freedom based upon the ideal of social equality. Those who advocated political reform before social freedom wanted to establish a democratic form of Government. Dr. Ambedkar put the question, was a democratic form of Government possible without a democratic form of society? His reply was, "It may not be necessary for

a democratic society to be marked by unity, by community of purpose, by loyalty to public ends and by mutuality of sympathy. But it does unmistakeably involve two things. The first is an attitude of mind, an attitude of respect and equality towards one's fellows. The second is a social organisation free from rigid social barriers. Democracy is incompatible and inconsistent with isolation and exclusiveness, resultng in the distinction betwen the privileged and the unprivileged." The view of Dr. Ambedkar was that legislation for social reform should precede political reform because it would help to establish rights in Hindu society which men would learn to respect and then and then alone could political progress and democracy be stable and valuable.

Dr. Sitaram Singh, the author of "Nationalism and Social Reform in India", concludes thus: "Nationalism and the Social Refoms Movements went side by side, each reacting upon and influencing the nature and character of the other." (p. 339).

SUGGESTED READINGS

Appadorai, A. : *Indian Political Thinking in the Twentieth Century from Naoroji to Nehru*, Oxford University Press, 1971.

Athalye, D.V. : *Life of Swami Vivekananda*, 1929.

Chintamani, C.Y. (Ed.) : *Indian Social Reform*, Madras, 1910.

Chirol, V. : *Indian Unrest*, London, 1910.

Cotton. H.J.S. : *Indian and Home Memories.*

Cotton, H.J.S. : *New India and India in Transition*, London, 1886.

Dayaram Gidumal : *Life and Life-work of Behramji M. Malabari*, Bombay, 1888.

Dayaram Gidumal : *Behramji M. Malabari*, London, 1892.

Ghose, H.P. : *Aurobindo, the Prophet of Indian Nationalism*, Calcutta, 1949.

Jayakar, M.R. : *The Story of My Life*, Bombay, 1958.

Karve, D.G. : *Ranade—the Prophet of Liberated India*, Poona, 1942.

Kellock : *Mahadeo Govinda Ranade*, 1926.

Mankar : *M.G. Ranade*, 1928.

Masani, R.P. : *Dadabhai Naoroji, the Grand Old Man of India*, 1939.

Morrison, J. : *A Study of Social, Political and Religious Developments*, London, 1907.

Natarajan, S. : *A Century of Social Reform in India*, Bombay, 1958.

Parvate, T.V. : *Bal Gangadhar Tilak*, Ahmedabad, 1958.

Ranade, M.G. : *Religious and Social Reform—A Collection of Essays and Speeches*, Bombay, 1902.

Singh, Sardar Yogendre : *B.M. Malabari*, London, 1914.

Singh. Sitaram : *Nationalism and Social Reform in India*, Delhi, 1968.

Sitaramayya, B.P. : *Indian Nationalism*, 1913.

Smith, W.R. : *Nationalism and Reform in India*, 1938.

Tagore, Rabindranath : *Nationalism*, London, 1950.

Telang, K.T. : *Must Social Reform Precede Political Reform in India*, Bombay, 1886.

Tilak, B.G. : *Speeches and Writings*, Madras, 1922.

Vivekananda, Swami : *Complete Works of Swami Vivekananda*, Almora, 1946.

Vyas, K.C. : *Social Renaissance in India*, Bombay, 1957.

CHAPTER XV

Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak (1856-1920)

In the words of Mahatma Gandhi, no man preached the gospel of Swaraj with the consistency and insistence of Lokmanya Tilak. His countrymen implicitly believed in him. His courage never failed him. His optimism was irrepressible. He hoped to see Swaraj fully established during his life-time. The view of Sri Aurobindo is that Tilak was the first political leader to break through the routine methods of the Indian National Congress which was dominated at that time by the Moderates. He tried to bridge the gulf between the present and the past and restore continuity to the political life of the nation. He developed a language and a spirit. He used methods which Indianised the national movement and brought into it the masses. He was a born leader of Maharashtra. He was the incarnation of Maratha character, Maratha qualities and Maratha spirit. He was not a demagogue. His speeches were made of hard and straight thinking. He was entirely a democratic politician who could both awaken the spirit of the masses and respond to their spirit. He moved among his followers as one of them in perfect equality. He was the leader not only of the educated but also of the merchant, the trader, the villager and the peasant. All Maharashtra understood him when he spoke or wrote and was ready to follow him when he signalled them. The view of former Chief Justice M. C. Chagla is that Tilak brought politics to the masses. He proclaimed that Swaraj was their birth-right. He inaugurated an open conspiracy for the attainment of what he considered was the birth-right of the people.

Tilak was born on 23 July 1856 at Ratnagiri in Maharashtra in a family of Chitpavan Brahmans and he died on 1 August 1920. He had English education in India and specialised in Mathematics and Sanskrit. When he studied law, he concentrated on classical Indian law. He was recognised as one of India's leading Sanskrit scholars.

In 1880, G. G. Agarkar and Tilak started the Poona English School. In 1884, they started the Deccan Education Society. They also started the Fergusson College at Poona. They also started editing and publishing two newspapers The Kesari, a Marathi-language weekly and the Mahratta, its counterpart in English language. On account of differences, Agarkar and Tilak parted in 1890. Tilak purchased the Kesari and the Mahratta and devoted himself to journalism. Agarkar and his co-workers got a free hand in the Deccan Education Society. As an editor, Tilak was unsurpassed and the above-mentioned two journals became tremendously influential and financially successful.

In 1894 Tilak organised the Ganapati festival. His view was that as the ancient Olympic festivals of the Greeks were a means of spreading national culture, creating national cohesiveness and providing pure and innocent enjoyment for the people, likewise festivals in India could serve the

purpose of establishing a sense of national identity. Through these national festivals, the Congress could achieve results which it was not possible for it to achieve otherwise. The religious festivals could be converted into mass political rallies.

In 1895, Tilak inaugurated the Shivaji festival. He wanted the national pride and enthusiasm of the people of Maharashtra to be centred on Shivaji. Tilak declared that a higher morality than that of the Indian Penal Code governs the life of nations.

Tilak possessed a fighting spirit. He did not agree with the programme and policies of the Moderates who were dominating the Congress at that time. In 1896, he publicly criticized the policy of the Moderates. In the same year, a severe famine struck Maharashtra and Tilak did his best to help the people. He criticized the Government for its lack of timely action. On the heels of the famine, Poona was stricken by an epidemic of plague. He did his utmost to serve the people through the machinery of the Government and also independently.

A youngman assassinated Rand, the Plague Commissioner of Poona and Tilak was blamed for his complicity in the conspiracy for the assassination. Tilak was brought to trial in 1897 on the charge of sedition and was sentenced to 18 months' rigorous imprisonment. He was asked to apologise but he refused.

When Lord Curzon partitioned Bengal in 1905 in spite of opposition from the public, Tilak condemned the action of the Government. He called upon the leaders of the people to awaken public opinion against the partition. He asked his fellow Maharashtrians to "give the Bengalis all necessary help" in the boycott movement. He started writing about the "religion of boycott" which was only the first of the new agitational techniques introduced after the partition of Bengal.

Tilak linked the Swadeshi movement with the boycott ideal. He called for a blanket protective tariff of 10 per cent on all imports to stimulate infant Indian industries. His view that if such a tariff was imposed immediately, "90 out of 100 articles which we require will be produced here within ten years." He saw the Swadeshi movement as a weapon of political agitation which could bring pressure first upon the merchants and then through them upon the political officers. He advocated the development of nation-wide Swadeshi organisations to help the nationalist cause. Before the end of 1905, Tilak had helped to organise the Bharat Vastu Pracharini Sabha (Society for the General Use of Indian Goods) which required its members to sign a pledge that as far as possible they will use only Indian articles and also induce others to do the same.

At the Shivaji festival in Poona on 25 June 1906, Tilak called upon his countrymen to undertake a powerful passive resistance movement. He established the right of the people to revolt against the rulers even if they did not possess the conventional weapons of warfare. He asked the people to become conscious of their power to make the administration impossible if they so decided. He asked them to apply their power and strength for the country.

In 1908, Tilak was again prosecuted on the charge of sedition for the ideas expressed by him in his editorials of 12 May and 9 June 1908 of the

Kesari. A Jury of 7 Europeans and 2 Parsees tried the case. All the Europeans held him guilty and both the Parsees found him innocent. Tilak was convicted and sentenced to deportation for six years which he spent in Mandalay Jail in Burma. He was placed in virtual solitary confinement in a prison cell. In spite of all the hardships, he survived and came back to India in 1914. He wrote the Gita Rahasya while in Jail.

During the World War I, Tilak asked the people of India to help the British Government in the hope that the Government would reciprocate but the Government did not.

As the Englishmen did not like the word Swaraj and considered the same to be "seditious and dangerous", Tilak decided to use the term "Home Rule" in place of Swaraj as the goal of his movement. He started the Indian Home Rule League on 28 April 1916 with its headquarters at Poona. The object of the League was to attain Home Rule or self-Government within the British Empire by all constitutional means. Tilak went on a whirlwind tour and appealed to the people to unite under the banner of the Home Rule League. His target was not the British Empire or the Emperor of India but the bureaucracy in India. He declared emphatically that Home Rule was the only cure for India's ills and grievances and liberty was the birth-right of every man. A small minority from outside India could not be allowed to rule the country arbitrarily. He demanded basic changes in the administration of India to promote the well-being of the people.

Tilak attended the Congress session in 1919 and his view was that although the Reforms of 1919 were inadequate, they should be accepted with the clear understanding that the Congress would fight for additional reforms and Swaraj was still its goal. Mahatma Gandhi put before the country his programme of Non-Cooperation and it was decided to hold a special session of the Congress at Calcutta in August 1920 to consider that programme. However, on the night of 31 July 1920, Tilak died at Bombay. As he lay dying, his last message to the people of India was: "Unless Swaraj is achieved, India shall not prosper. It is required for our existence."

Was Tilak a Revolutionary?

The foreign critics of Tilak and the Indian revolutionaries regarded Tilak as a revolutionary. In his book entitled "India", Valentine Chirol wrote, "Tilak had been the first to create the atmosphere which breeds murders." The view of J. S. Hoyland, the biographer of Gokhale, is that Tilak had been "conquetting with doctrines of physical force." When Tilak was prosecuted in 1908, the prosecutor contended that the articles written by Tilak contained "a covert threat of mutiny" and Tilak was preaching "Swaraj or bombs".

The view of Dr. P. S. Khankhoje is that Tilak was the teacher and preceptor of the revolutionary youth of India. He also instructed some youngmen to acquire military training. Dr. V. M. Bhatt holds the view that upto 1908, Tilak was intimately associated with the revolutionaries and also encouraged them. He did not refer to his revolutionary policies and actions in his speeches and writings but he disclosed them to those persons who were in his confidence.

It is also pointed out that Tilak was in touch with some of the lead-

ing revolutionaries of his time. He knew Shyamji Krishna Varma who had his headquarters in London and was helping the revolutionaries working in England and on the Continent. Tilak wrote an article on Shyamji Krishna Varma and compared him to Hyndman who was a great advocate of India's freedom. The father of V. D. Savarkar was a great admirer of Tilak and Tilak gave a letter of recommendation to V. D. Savarkar when the latter went to London for higher studies. Tilak was in touch with V. D. Savarkar even in 1908. Tilak wrote a letter to Montagu, Secretary of State for India, asking for the release of V. D. Savarkar. Tilak had a hand in the opening of the arms factory in Nepal in 1903.

Those who maintain that Tilak was a revolutionary also point out to certain passages put into the mouth of Shivaji by Tilak in his paper The Kesari in which Shivaji complained that whatever had been achieved by him, was lost by the people of Maharashtra and he called upon them to restore that glory at any cost.

In the course of a speech in 1907, Tilak observed, "The path of duty is never sprinkled with rose water, nor do roses grow on it. It is true that what we seek may seem like a revolution in the sense that it means a complete change in the 'theory' of the Government of India as now put forward by the bureaucracy."

"Your revolution," he observed, "must be bloodless, but that does not mean that you may not have to suffer or to go to jail. Your fight is with the bureaucracy who will always try to curb and suppress you. But you must remember that consistently with the spirit of laws and the bloodlessness of the revolution, there are a hundred other means by which you may and ought to achieve your object.... Though downtrodden and neglected, you must be conscious of your power of making the administration impossible if you but choose to make it so. Let your place be filled by Europeans on the splendid salary of eight annas a day, if possible."

Critics also point out that Tilak went to the extent of supporting the action of Shivaji in killing Afzal Khan. To quote him, "With benevolent intentions, he (Shivaji) murdered Afzal Khan for the good of others. If thieves enter our house and we have not sufficient strength in our wrists to drive them out, we should, without hesitation, shut them up and burn them alive. God had not conferred upon Mlechhas the Sanad, inscribed on a copper plate, of the kingdom of Hindustan."

In spite of these allegations, it is contended that Tilak was not a revolutionary by nature. His genius was not destructive but constructive. He was a shrewd, practical man. His life was not governed by emotions. Ordinarily, he was always ready for a compromise. He was not an academic politician. He was determined to awaken the national spirit among the people of India and prepare them for freedom. He tried to inculcate among his countrymen the habits of independent thinking and self-reliance but those could not be called revolutionary activities. He did not believe in a policy of absolute Ahimsa. He had admiration for daring and skill. He would not condemn violence if that was resorted to for a noble cause. However, he did not incite political murders or outright violence. He advocated the adoption of the methods of agitation. In 1906, he asked the people of Nasik not to resort to revolutionary activities. His considered

view was that violence and political murders would give an opportunity to the British Government to resort to a policy of wholsesale repression and persecution and that was likely to harm the national cause. He asked the people to refrain from violence on the ground of expediency. Although he himself did not resort to violence, he would not condemn those revolutionaries in India who were sacrificing their lives at the altar of their country. He himself did not contemplate any armed insurrection or revolution. However, he stood for a fundamental change in the system of administration in India. He wanted the rule of British bureaucracy to be replaced by a Government run by the Indians and for that objective he worked day and night. If working for such a revolutionary change Tilak can be called a revolutionary, he was certainly so in that sense.

Tilak and Religion

Tilak was a Hindu and he took pride in his religion. He had great reverence for the Hindu scriptures. He was of the definite view that the fall of the Hindus was not due to the Hindu religion. He held Lord Krishna in high esteem. This is amply proved by his Commentary on the Gita—called Gita Rahasya. He was not opposed to all religious ceremonies or rituals and he wanted them to be changed to suit the changed circumstances. He was not a reactionary in matters of religion.

The view of Tilak was that Hindu religion provided a moral and a social tie and united the people. He called upon the people to revive that union. To quote him, "A Hindu of this place is as much a Hindu as the one from Madras or Bombay. The study of the Gita, Ramayana and Mahabharata produces the same idea throughout the country. If we lay stress on it forgetting all the ordinary differences that exist between different sects, then by the grace of Providence, we shall ere long be able to consolidate all the different sects into a mighty Hindu nation." He believed that science was no substitute for the sacred Hindu religion.

In his Commentary on the Gita, Tilak expounded the doctrine of Karma-Yoga, "The Religion of Action". His view was that our forefathers never intended that the goal of life should be meditation alone. No person can expect God to protect him if he sits with folded arms and throws his burden on others. God does not help the indolent. Proper action alone is the road to salvation. That man is truly learned who is also the doer. Gita-Rahasya is a more important work of nationalist literature than of philosophy. Tilak gave his countrymen a stirring and vigorous call to selfless action. To quote Sir Radhakrishnan, "It was Mr. Tilak's robust patriotism that predisposed his mind to this activist view."

Tilak an Education

The view of Tilak was that the Western system of education in India was ruinous to the future health and well-being of the nation. The younger generations were being educated away not only from their families and the great majority of the Indian people but also away from the value system of India's civilisation. The Government-supported Western education uprooted the youth from their ties with the past and made them Indians only in name. Moreover, Western education was available only to a few persons who could afford to go to Western schools and the great bulk of the people

of India were left untouched by any kind of formal education. What was necessary was the introduction of national education in the country.

The plan of national education involved the establishment of schools throughout the country dedicated to giving young India a truly national educational background. The useful lessons of Western education were not to be ignored but were to be supplemented with the lessons of India's own great culture. Tilak wanted the Congress to support with all its assets the establishment of schools and colleges throughout the country to provide inexpensive and wholesome education emphasizing the new spirit of self-reliance which young people could not expect to receive in the institutions supported by the Government.

Tilak condemned the existing system of English education on the ground that it neglected religious education. He emphasized the importance of religious education for the building of character in these words: "Secular education only is not enough to build up a character. Religious education is necessary because the study of high principles keeps us away from evil pursuits."

Love for Country

Tilak put great emphasis on love for the country. History and tradition, religion and philosophy, action and unity were made meaningful in the concept of love of the country. To quote Tilak, "God and our country are not different. In short, our country is one form of God." The love of nation, like the love of God, has to transcend narrow provincialism, communalism and sectarianism. It has to be the first cause for both action and unity.

Boycott

Tilak was one of the first to realise that boycott which originally started with the refusal of the people to purchase goods manufactured in England could be expanded to the point of jeopardising the foundation of the whole British administrative machinery in India. In a speech at Poona in 1902, Tilak said, "You must realise that you are a great factor in the power with which the administration in India is conducted. You are yourselves the useful lubricants which enable the gigantic machinery to work so smoothly. Though down-trodden and neglected, you must be conscious of your power of making the administration impossible if you but choose to make it so. It is you who manage the rail-road and the telegraph; it is you who make settlements and collect revenues; it is in fact you who do everything for the administration though in a subordinate capacity. You must consider whether you cannot turn your hand to better use for your nation than drudging on in this fashion."

Boycott became a very important political weapon but its effective use demanded courage and a large measure of self-sacrifice. This fact was emphasized by Tilak in a speech at Calcutta, "If you have not the power of active resistance, have you not the power of self-denial and self-abstinence in such a way as not to assist this foreign Government to rule over you? This is boycott and this is what is meant when we say that boycott is a political weapon".

Tilak declared that the Moderates could not deliver the goods and the

people should look up to the Extremists for the liberation of their country. The repetition of resolutions full of prayers to the Government could not bring any results. The remedy was not petitions but boycott. To quote him, "We are not armed and there is no necessity for arms either. We have a strong weapon, a political weapon in boycott. The whole of this administration which is carried on by a handful of Englishmen is carried on with our assistance. We are in subordinate service. We are clerks and willing instruments of our own oppression in the hands of an alien Government and the Government is ruling over us not by its innate strength but by keeping us in ignorance and blindness to the perception of this fact. Every Englishman knows that they are a mere handful in this country and it is the business of every one of them to fool you into believing that you are weak and they are strong. What the new Party wants to do is to realise the fact that your future rests entirely in your hands."

Swadeshi

Like the other Extremists, Tilak also advocated Swadeshi. Tilak wrote, "The object is to bring about the spread of Swadeshi things, visible and invisible, to bring about the gradual disappearance of visible foreign things and to bring about the gradual disappearance of foreign ideas also." Again, "Like the bodies, our minds also should become Swadeshi. Swadeshi thoughts should always reign in our hearts." Swadeshi was the first assertion of the spirit of independence. The Indians were asked to become self-reliant and independent in all things and thereby earn all the rights and privileges of free men. The Swadeshi movement was a movement of national regeneration. Swadeshi was a practical application of the love of the country. To quote Tilak, "To recognise the land of the Aryas as mother earth is the Swadeshi movement." It was an economic, political and spiritual weapon.

Swaraj

Swaraj played an important part in the political philosophy of the Indian value system. It referred both to the self-rule of the individual and the self-rule of the political community. Swaraj was a part of both the philosophy of life and the philosophy of politics. To quote Tilak, "The idea of Swaraj is an old one". For the individual, Swaraj means the exercise of his freedom lawfully. It means the choice of cosmos over chaos and the regulation of all actions morally in accordance with the Swadharma of the individual. Unless there is Swaraj, the individual cannot live in his true nature. He cannot attain and fulfil the purpose of life. Likewise, Swaraj is meaningful in the classical philosophy of politics for the political community. It means the lawful exercise of freedom by the community. Unless there is Swaraj, the right ordering of the community can never be attained. Men cannot live in their true nature and the purpose of life and creation cannot be fulfilled. The political community exists only to preserve and promote the Dharma and without Swaraj that is not possible. Therefore, Swaraj is necessary for both the individual and the community. Without Swaraj, life is not worthwhile. Tilak maintained that "Our life and our Dharma are in vain in the absence of Swaraj."

The view of Tilak was that the evils of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in India were largely the result of the weakening of the Indian

social order on account of its long struggle to preserve the Dharma in the absence of Swaraj. The only lasting remedy for the social evils is the re-establishment of Swaraj or self-rule. Life has no moral purpose unless there is Swaraj to protect and promote the Dharma.

Tilak defined Swaraj in these words: "People's rule instead of that of bureaucracy is Swaraj". This was the essence of his argument that the social reformers wanted to have the support of British bureaucracy to enforce the measures of social reform. His own view was that unless the people supported the reforms, the reforms were not only meaningless but also undemocratic and without moral significance. There must be popular control over the power of Government. Swaraj must be democratic.

Tilak believed that all progress, all hope for national advancement, rested on Swaraj. No issue had precedence over Swaraj. In his public speeches Tilak often said, "If we do not get Swarajya, there will be no industrial progress; if we do not get Swarajya, there will be no possibility of having any kind of education useful to the nation, either primary or higher. If we do get Swarajya it is not merely to advance female education or to secure industrial reform or social reform. All these are parts of Swarajya. Power is wanted first." Swarajya was a moral imperative, for "there is no question which is not dependent upon Swarajya." Again, "We demand Swarajya, as it is the foundation and not the height of our future prosperity."

Tilak was not interested in securing Government posts for deserving Indians. He repeatedly said, "To get posts of big salaries is not the meaning of Swarajya". Swarajya meant a total change in political theory. To quote Tilak, "It is true that what we seek may seem like a revolution in the sense that it means a complete change in the theory of the Government of India as now put forward by the bureaucracy." Tilak always insisted, "Swarajya is the foundation".

In one of his meetings, Tilak declared, "We are at present clamouring for Swaraj and therefore the Shivaji festival is the most fitting one for us to celebrate. If Shivaji was able to establish Swarajya two centuries ago, we too may expect to achieve it some day. Swarajya belongs to us by birthright. The Moderates can be compared to Shivaji's father Shahji who always used to advise his son not to take up arms against the mighty Mohammedan monarchs of the Deccan. But Shivaji, who can be compared to the Extremists of the present day, gave a new turn to events. We are masters of our fortunes and can govern them if we only make up our minds to do so. Swarajya is not far off from us. It will come to us the moment we learn to stand on our legs." His slogan at the meetings was: "Swarajya is my birthright. I will have it."

Passive Resistance

Tilak was a practical political leader and a realist. He foresaw that violence would be wasteful and ultimately ineffectual. To quote Tilak, "We say prepare your forces, organise your power and then go to work so that they cannot refuse you what you demand. We are not armed and there is not necessity for arms either." Being a realist, Tilak recognised that "the military strength of the Government is enormous and a single machine-gun

showering hundreds of bullets per minute will quite suffice for our largest public meetings." Action must be direct but it must be passive as well. To quote Tilak, "As our fight is going to be constitutional and legal, our death also must, as of necessity be constitutional and legal. We have not to use any violence."

Philosophy of Defiance

Tilak taught the people of India the philosophy of defiance. If the Government was not prepared to concede willingly, any methods could be employed to make the Government do what the people wanted it to do. He was convinced that no power in the world could withhold from the people their right to independence. The people looked upon Tilak as "the man who is to expel the British from India." Tilak did not make a fetish of non-violence. To risk life for the cause of one's country is the greatest sacrifice one can make.

Tilak on Social Reform

Tilak has been described as the leader of the Extremists in politics but in matters relating to social reform, he was the leader of the Moderate Party. Even during the formative period of his career, he believed that social reform could not precede political reform and differed from Agarkar on this point. Agarkar was a champion of social enlightenment and advocated progressive and liberal social legislation. He had a burning passion for the eradication of the social evils in Hindu society and saw no harm in the foreign Government making laws for social and marital regulation. He believed that if social reforms were carried out, the political problems would be easily solved. The view of Tilak was that political reforms must come first and when that was achieved, social reform would become a simple matter. Tilak told Agarkar, "You can shout your social reform from the house-tops, but what will you say to a peasant if he comes to you and says, 'You ask me to put my house in order. Alright, but where is the house?' Then you will have to give him a house first. You see all our activities must lead to providing a house for the homeless. What I say is, 'Give the people the homes and then ask them to put them in order.'"

Tilak was not a social reactionary. As a matter of fact, he was a social revolutionary in his individual life. In the year 1890, he signed a circular on social reform which was drafted by Justice Ranade. That circular advocated the following reforms: (1) Not more than a year's income should be spent on the marriage ceremonies of a son. (2) Not more than a year's income should be spent on the marriage ceremonies of a daughter. (3) Boys should not marry before the ages of 16, 18 or 20. (4) Daughters should not be married before the ages of 10, 12, or 14. (5) Polygamy should be prohibited. (6) No one should marry after the age of 60. (7) Liquor should be taken medicinally only. (8) Every possible effort should be made to promote female education.

Although Tilak was opposed to the Age of Consent Bill, 1891, he believed and in fact practised what was the main principle of that Bill. He sent his daughters to school to learn English and did not marry them until they were 16. He did not observe untouchability and caste distinctions in his household. Hence, Tilak cannot be called a social reactionary.

Tilak believed in Aryadharma. He was not a blind follower of orthodoxy. He did not overlook or excuse the evils in the social system. However, he was the foremost of those in India who opposed the extremist measures of the social reformers. The very fact that he did not join the reformers, they indicted him as a defender of orthodoxy. He was condemned as a reactionary and the spokesman for backwardness. However, that was not correct. He earnestly hoped to see the evils in the social system removed and the entire system reformed. He also put forward his own concrete proposals for improving social conditions. He was a staunch advocate of progress but he was opposed to the grandiose schemes of the Westernised reformers. Instead of schemes, Tilak wanted concrete programmes for meeting the needs of the people. He was not an arm-chair reformer. He was a worker with and for the people.

Tilak had his own reasons for opposing Ranade, Gokhale, Bhandarkar, Malabari, Agarkar and others. His view was that without a full appreciation of the values that had been preserved and transmitted by the social system, these reformers were willing to discard virtually everything, to remake India almost totally in the image of the West and to base Indian social forms on the values they had learned from their Western education. Tilak considered that as folly. He considered it criminal to banish everything created by India's civilization simply because Indian values and Indian religion did not coincide with the European notions of materialism, rationalism and utilitarianism. To quote Tilak, "A number of our educated men began to accept uncritically the materialistic doctrines of the Westerners. Thus we have the pathetic situation of the new generation making on their minds a carbon copy of the gross materialism of the West." Tilak reminded the social reformers that "our present downfall is not due to Hindu religion but to the fact that we have absolutely forsaken religion". Tilak also contended that as the reformers could not inspire mass popular support for their social reform programme, they sought the help of the British Government in India to bring about the social change. Tilak maintained that to remake India in the image of the West would mean to destroy her greatness and to use the force of an alien Raj to impose any kind of reform would make that reform itself immoral.

Tilak pointed out that the social reformers conceived their schemes for reform from the Western value system and that made them anti-traditionalist and iconoclastic. They were prepared to believe that virtually everything Indian was an evil, unprogressive and degrading. Tilak pointed out that the Westernised social reformers did not understand either the classical ethics or the classical methods of meeting problems. They did not understand India's way of life. Tilak wrote, "As the works of purely materialistic philosophers on Ethics are principally taught in our colleges, the fundamental principles of the Karma-Yoga, mentioned in the Gita, are not well understood even by learned persons among us, who have had an English education."

Tilak pointed out that those who did not know the old were preparing to reconstruct the radically new. No civilization could withstand an attack on all its beliefs and ways of life. He maintained that if the social reformers succeeded in their mission and were successful in bringing about the reforms advocated by them, all the classical values would be lost. The moral

stamina of the people would be undermined and the national will would be broken. Tilak was not prepared to tolerate the possibility of such a national suicide. He knew that reforms were necessary but not in a way which would destroy the whole civilization of the country.

When the Age of Consent Bill, 1891 was before the Legislature, the social reformers insisted that the British Government should pass a law raising the age of consent for girls in Hindu marriages. Tilak did not disagree with the objective of the Bill but he was opposed to the employment of coercion by a foreign Government to enforce the social reform. His view was that a foreign bureaucracy had no right to sit in the legislative judgement on the Indian society. He also felt that the social reformers were totally misguided in trying to bring about those social reforms. He pointed out that if there were political freedom in India and the people themselves could enact legislation and thereby use the power of the state to promote social reform, then that procedure would be democratic and morally justifible. As the people do not have self-rule, it is only by education and not by coercion that social reforms should be carried out. That was the only way to make the reforms democratic and moral. Social reform must not be inspired by a small group of reformers and enforced upon the community by the power of an alien Raj. Such a procedure was indefensible if the reformers were to make any claim to having morally elevated or reformed the Indian social system. Let there be social reform but the people must be educated regarding its necessity and they must also initiate the same. The desire of a minority to imitate an alien social order is not a justification for social action.

Tilak was criticized on the ground that he was negative and disruptive, but actually he was an advocate of social reform. To quote Tilak, "I am a liberal Hindu". Again, "We have always been advocates of reform, reform we say, but not of rebellion or licence." The reformism of Tilak was the product of his moral frame of reference which was based on the philosophy of life of Indian civilization. Tilak would not content himself with analysing evils of the existing social order but would also suggest the necessary changes to be made in the social system. The view of Tilak was that those who believed in social reform should be the first to practise the reforms advocated by them. The reform of the leaders would set an example for others. To the extent society followed their example, the acceptance of the reforms would be democratic and moral. Tilak practised whatever he preached. In his own family, he postponed the marriage of his daughters until the limit of 16 years was reached. He was loyal both to his convictions about the need for reform and to the classical heritage which was his guide.

The view of Tilak was that if legislation was going to be employed to bring about social reform, it should not be used to enforce reform practices on the masses who neither understood the reforms nor appreciated their potential benefits. He advocated that social legislation be passed to bind the educated members of society, especially those who advocated reforms and the use of state power to enforce them, to live up to the reforms they preached. He was himself willing to be bound by such laws. If the other social reformers joined him in this procedure, the example which they would set would inspire confidence in the people and help them in copying

the same. Tilak proposed that laws be passed on the following subjects and applied to all the educated reformers:—

(1) Daughters should not be married until they reached the age of 16 instead of 12 as advocated by reformers and boys should not marry until they are 20.

(2) Unless they were prepared to marry widows, men should not marry after they were 40 years old.

(3) The educated reformers should be absolutely prohibited from taking alcohol.

(4) The reformers and their families be prohibited from accepting dowries in marriages.

(5) There should be no disfigurement of widows.

(6) One-tenth of the monthly income of every reformer should be devoted to public purposes.

Tilak also suggested that the social reformers should mix with the people and educate them to the necessity of reforming the decadent aspects of the caste-ridden social order. They must not remain aloof from the people in their dignified and intellectual societies. They should speak the language of the people and through education encourage them to desire social reform. Tilak believed that this procedure would be beneficial not only to society but also to the social reformers themselves. By mixing with the people the social reformers might begin to appreciate the values of the people. To quote Tilak, "If the educated want to take up the social education factor, they must mix with the common people. Those who want to be the leaders of the people must be in touch with the people to understand what are their needs, how much religious ardour they have got and to what channel their energy should be turned in order to gain national good."

Tilak believed that reform must grow from within the people. Attempts to coerce the community to accept reform were absurd. Reform must be based on the value system of the people and not on the values taught to the Westernised few who had their education in an alien system of education. Popular education must be initiated with an understanding of the classical values and must proceed to recreate to the vitality of those values in the forms of social order. Tilak believed that "religious education will first and foremost engage our attention." In this way, a new spirit will be born in India. India need not copy from other civilisations when she can rely on the spirit of her past greatness. D. V. Athalye writes, "The difference was this, that while Ranade was prepared, if convenient, to coquette with religious sanction to social order, Mr. Tilak insisted that there should be no divorce between the two."

Tilak wanted genuine reform in society and not simple imitation of Western life and manners. He believed that such reform must come from the people and not from a foreign Government. He struggled to re-awaken India to her past and base her future greatness on her past glories. Knowing full well that real progress can only be made by a self-governing people, knowing that moral progress can only be made through moral and democratic decisions, knowing that Swaraj or self-rule was the pre-requisite of

real social, political, economic, cultural and spiritual progress, Tilak began to think in terms of achievement of Swaraj. The social reformers were prepared to criticise almost everything Indian, to imitate the West in the name of improvement and rely upon the power of a foreign Government to bring about this improvement. They were convinced that only by social reform could they earn political reform and social reform must precede political reform. The view of Tilak was that political reform must precede social reform. It is only popular self-Government that is moral Government. It is only a moral Government that can create moral social changes. Hence, self-rule is necessary and the first object to be pursued must be political reform and not social reform.

Tilak was a realist. He recognised that it was not simply the forms and practices of society which had to be changed. The evils in social practices were the direct result of the spirit of orthodoxy which filled the forms of social order and resisted change. That spirit was the result of a hundred years of foreign overlordship, defeat, instability, defensiveness and inflexibility. Tilak believed that effective reform must ultimately depend upon a re-awakening of the true spirit of Indian people. Instead of criticizing social forms as the great evils, Tilak started his battle against the spirit of orthodoxy which was locked up in forms, rituals and customs that had survived their usefulness. The orthodox spirit had served its purpose because it had transmitted classical values to a new generation which could understand them and bring about the necessary re-birth and re-application of those values. The degraded aspects of the spirit of orthodoxy were lethargy, indolence, inaction and exclusiveness. They had fed on disunity and divisiveness born of defensiveness and rigidity. From that had arisen casteism in all its worst manifestation, defeatism and fatalism, the loss of the ideal of harmonious social cooperation, of courage and self-respect. The spirit of atrophied orthodoxy had religious justification.

Tilak believed that there must be a change in the hearts of the people and not as the reformers believer, a change in the form of institutions. He tried to reach the people in order to change their hearts. N. G. Kelkar writes about Tilak, "Through his paper, The Kesari, he exercised an immense influence over the masses and it is this influence that is mainly responsible for the infusion of a new spirit among the people." Tilak taught both from the class-room and the public platform his new message of awakening India. He tried to reach the people through the employment of national festivals. He popularised two great festivals: The Ganapati festival and the Shivaji festival. Ganapati is the Hindu deity of learning and propitiousness. The object of the Shivaji festival was to revive the memory and glory of Shivaji, the liberator of Maharashtra and the restorer of Swaraj through his battle with the Mughal Empire. He emphasized the dynamic spirit of Shivaji. He wrote, "It is the spirit which actuated Shivaji in his doings that is held forth as the proper ideal to be kept constantly in view of the rising generation." Tilak worked ceaselessly to reach the people and educate them through the festivals. Throughout Maharashtra, he spread his message among the people through religion and history, the association in the popular mind with gods and heroes and an appreciation of the heritage of the past as a guide to the future. He became the spokesman of the tradition-directed masses of India and also the defender and awakener of India's philosophy of life. He taught first the Dharma of action. He re-

minded the people that India could not become a great nation through negativism and indolence but through a dynamic willingness to meet the problems of the day and solve them morally. He reminded the people that God did not protect those who kept sitting with folded arms. God did not help the indolent. No society could survive, let alone prosper, if the people refused to assert themselves actively. Action alone must be the guiding principle. The people must have an energetic and self-reliant approach to life. Self-respect is the necessary foundation for effective action and eventual self-rule. To inculcate the spirit of activism, Tilak constantly appealed to the greatness of the religious faith of the people and the lessons of the history of India. Whether one went to the Vedas for one's guidance or went to the heroes of history, one would find that in either case the first pre-requisite was the willingness to work and sacrifice for an ideal. Self-sacrifice was necessary for the greatness of India. To quote Tilak, "Whatever a man does, must be taken to have been done by him for the purpose of the Yajna (sacrifice). In as much as the Vedas themselves have enjoined the performance of the Yajnas, any action done for the purpose of the Yajna cannot of itself be a source of bondage to man." Tilak taught the dharma of action and the dharma of unity. The unity of India is the Bharatdharma, the spiritually based and spiritually dedicated way of life. The spirit of orthodoxy had done injustice to that way of life. It had placed man in segregated and exclusive caste communities which were inimical to the feeling of common heritage and common cause. The true spirit of the caste system was harmony, cooperation and unity. Tilak condemned the divisiveness of the caste system. To quote him, "Communal jealousies and caste rivalries are the weak points in our armour, but we must strengthen our position by sinking all differences amongst ourselves." Tilak pointed out that national unity was above all communities and the unity of India was greater than the interests of any sect.

Tilak did not believe in a policy of fanaticism in the matter of social reform. He did not approve of the extreme type of orthodoxy and would like to make changes demanded by the change in circumstances and times. Likewise, he did not want the social reformers to go too far. He stood for a compromise between the two extremes. He wrote in the Kesari of 7 June 1892, "There is considerable resemblance betwen our difficulties in the political field and those in the social one; neither the political administration nor the structure of our society completely satisfies us. We want to reform both. The English administration as well as the Indian society have solid foundation; we are, therefore, bound to proceed with caution. Now, if people are willing to accept political reforms in a spirit of conciliation and compromise, we fail to understand why we should like to proceed with social reform in an arrogant and defiant manner. If we are prepared to make compromise when the Parliament passes the Councils' Act, 1892, why should we not do so with respect to questions like widow-remarriage? Fanatical opposition might occasionally be successful but as a rule, in political as well as social matters, fanaticism is suicidal."

Tilak was opposed to untouchability. In the Ganapati celebrations, the people from the lower castes were allowed to take their statues of the God Ganesa in procession alongwith statues belonging to the higher castes. In 1918, Tilak agreed to offer his cooperation to V. R. Shinde of the Depressed Classes Mission in solving the problem of untouchability. On 25

March 1918, Tilak declared that untouchability must go. All Indians were the children of the same motherland and there could be no spiritual or moral defence of untouchability. To quote him, "If a god were to tolerate untouchability, I would not recognise him as god". In July 1920, he attended a Kirtan party organised by the members of the Depressed Classes of Poona. He conceded that he could not devote time to social reform as all of his time was taken away by his work in the political field. To quote Tilak, "I regard India as my Motherland and my Goddess, the people of India my kith and kin and loyal and steadfast work for their political and social emancipation my biggest religion and duty."

The official biographer of Tilak writes, "One is forced to admit that he never felt the same moral fervour and enthusiasm for social reform which he felt for the cause of political independence. This was perhaps partly due, as some of the critics have claimed, to the narrow religious influences which prevailed in and around Poona, Tilak's main centre of activity. Believing that the division of energies means the dissipation of energies, he made his choice—to the exclusion of every other consideration—of working for the political emancipation of the country. Though he had apathy for social reform, Tilak was opposed only to the use of the state machinery to bring about social reform and more so because this machinery was controlled by foreign government."

Revivalism

Tilak was a revivalist in the sense that he wanted to revive all that was good and noble in India's culture and civilization. He was a great Sanskrit scholar and a student of classical Indian literature. He was opposed to the wholesale adoption of the materialistic doctrines of the West by the educated Indians but this does not mean that he was a narrow-minded person in his outlook. He appreciated whatever was good in the West and was prepared to adopt the same. It is pointed out that when he started the Ganapati and Shivaji festivals, he took his inspiration from a source outside India. Tilak's study of Greek history and the idea of Olympic games contained therein led to the organisation of Ganapati festival. The inauguration of the Shivaji festival had its origin in the attitude of hero worship borrowed by Tilak from Carlyle and Emerson. In his college days, Tilak himself had spent a lot of time in studying the Western writers like Kant, Hegel, Bentham, Mill, Voltaire and Rousseau. Tilak was not against reforms. He was against the one-sided and dogmatic attitude of those who wanted to remake India in the image of the West. What he wanted was that "a proper knowledge of the old traditions and philosophies must be imparted to the newly educated classes and the Pandits and Shastrics must be given information about the newly changed and changing circumstances."

Traditionalism and Modernity

Tilak stood neither for wholesale traditionalism nor wholesale modernisation. He was against the blind imitation of the traditions of India. He was also against the blind imitation of the West. He stood for a synthesis between traditionalism and modernity. He was basically a conservative Hindu and would like to keep as much of the old traditions as were compatible with the modern times. He would like the old traditions to be changed to

suit the changing circumstances. Sri Aurobindo writes, "Tilak's separation from social reform leader, Agarkar, had opened the way for the peculiar role which he played as a trusted and accredited leader of conservative and religious India in the path of democratic politics. It was this position which enabled him to effect the union of the new political spirit with the tradition and the sentiment of the historic past and of both with the inerad'cable religious temperament of the people, of which these festivals (Ganapati and Shivaji festivals) were the symbol. The Congress was for a long time occidential in mind, character and methods, confined to the English educated few, founded on the political rights and interests of the people read in the light of English history and European ideals, but with no faith either in the past of the country or in the inner spirit of the nation. Mr. Tilak was the first political leader to break through the routine of somewhat academical methods, to bridge the gulf between the present and the past and to restore continuity to the political life of the nation. He developed a language and a spirit and he used methods which Indianised the movement and brought it to the masses."

Tilak was a conservative leader. His view was that the only bridge between the illiterate Hindu masses and the educated middle class was that of Indian traditions. He wanted the Indian National Congress to be a mass organisation. That was possible only if he put emphasis on Indian traditions. It is not correct to say that Tilak put emphasis on the traditions of India for any political reason. He had a firm faith in Indian religions, culture, and philosophy. He believed that nationalism in India could not be built in a vacuum and its foundations must be religious and cultural. Tilak wanted to preserve the traditions of India by re-capturing them in the light of the changed circumstances. His own interpretation of Hindu religion was a great advance and was not traditional. It is maintained that modern Hinduism owes a great deal to Tilak. His interpretation of the Gita was received not only by the conservative Hindus but also by the educated persons among the Hindus. Tilak was not only the leader of the conservative Hindus but also the father of modern Hinduism. He was a bridge between tradition and modernity. Lala Lajpat Rai writes, "The difference between the Moderates and followers of Tilak is that the former are bent on relying more upon reason and the experience of European society, while the latter are disposed to primarily look at their Shastras and the past history and the traditions of their people and the ancient institutions of the land which were in vogue when the nation was at the zenith of its glory".

Critics point out that the attitude of Tilak towards traditions gave rise to revivalism which in turn resulted in counter-reformism. It is also contended that his attitude strengthened separatist tendencies and organisations in Indian politics. He is also accused of religious obscurantism and narrow sectarianism. However, it can be said in defence of Tilak that his attitude was necessary at the time for building up national confidence among the people of India.

Tilak and Gokhale

Tilak has often been compared with Gokhale. Gokhale joined the Deccan Education Society in 1886 of which Tilak was already a founder member. Tilak was a Professor of Mathematics at the Fergusson College when Gokhale

joined that College as a Professor of English. It was there that Gokhale and Tilak came into personal contact with each other. They were colleagues in the College for four years but Tilak resigned from the Deccan Education Society in October 1890 because Gokhale became the Secretary of the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha.

In 1895, there was an open clash between Tilak and Gokhale because Tilak insisted that the Social Conference should not be held in the Mandap of the Indian National Congress. His contention was that the principles of the social reformers were against the teachings of Hindu religion and not acceptable to the masses. He did not want the masses to be alienated from the Congress on the ground that the Social Conference was associated with it. He resigned his post as a Secretary of the Reception Committee of the Indian National Congress and organised an agitation against the Social Reforms Party. As Tilak had captured the Poona Sarvajanik Sabha, Gokhale resigned his secretaryship of that Sabha.

There were further differences between Tilak and Gokhale. Their fields of service and their audiences were different. Tilak became more and more a mass leader while Gokhale remained the representative of the intelligentsia and the spokesman of the Indian National Congress. Their fields of work were separate. While Gokhale was giving his evidence before the Welby Commision in England, Tilak was busy in Poona helping all those who were the victims of plague. When Gokhale was working in the Bombay Legislative Council, Tilak was organising Ganapati and Shivaji festivals. While Gokhale was busy in the Imperial Legislative Council, Tilak was busy in his campaigns of boycott and Swadeshi. They agreed on the question of the treatment of the Indians in South Africa. However, they disagreed violently on the celebrations of the Ganapati and Shivaji festivals. They were closest to each other in 1905 when Gokhale presided over the session of the Indian National Congress at Banaras. However, the split in the Congress at Surat in 1907 kept them separate. Gokhale would like to come to an understanding with Tilak but Pherozeshah Mehta stood in the way.

The political goal of Tilak and Gokhale was the same. Both of them demanded self-Government or Swaraj within the British Empire. Although in his heart Tilak may have desired complete independence for India but he did not say in public that he stood for the severance of the British connection. However, while Tilak asserted that "Swaraj is my birth-right and I will have it", the view of Gokhale was that our advance towards self-Government should be gradual and based on the principle "first deserve and then desire". While the concept of Swaraj of Tilak was a spiritual one, the ideal of self-Government of Gokhale was a Western political concept. In their political programme, Tilak and Gokhale had certain common meeting grounds. Tilak presented to the country the programme of boycott, Swadeshi and national education. Gokhale also advocated Swadeshi and the programme of national education as the President of the Indian National Congress in 1905. He even justified the movement for the boycott of British goods as practised in Bengal as a political weapon and as a last resort. Gokhale was a Moderate and he believed in strictly constitutional methods. He hoped to influence public opinion in England by sending deputations, supporting a newspaper and pleading the justice of the cause of India. Tilak had no faith in such methods. He believed that all that effort was

useless because the Indians could never succeed in changing the attitude of the Englishmen towards India as that conflicted with their own interests. Gokhale and Tilak differed in their attitude towards social reform. Gokhale stood for moderation in politics and an advanced outlook on social reform. Tilak advocated revolutionary methods in politics and evolutionary policies in social reform. Gokhale believed that state may intervene when an influential and enlightened minority in a certain community demanded certain measures of social reform even when those ideas were in advance of the views of the bulk of the community. His view was that state intervention in such matters was an extreme measure and must be undertaken by the state only with the help and cooperation of the enlightened section of the community and only with a view to furthering the progress of the Indian society. Tilak also stood for social reform but he maintained that political reform must precede social reform. As a matter of political tactics, he would not alienate the orthodox Hindus from the Congress by supporting radical measures of social reform.

Both Tilak and Gokhale ruled out the use of violence in India's struggle for independence. Tilak admitted that the military strength of the British Government in India was so enormous that any violent action by the people of India could be crushed. Moreover, as India's fight was constitutional and legal, there was no place for violence.

Theoretically, Gokhale also believed in passive resistance but he pleaded resistance only as a measure of defence and not of attack. He insisted that the passive resistance movement must be moral and spiritual and carried on without vindictiveness. His view was that the circumstances in India neither permitted nor necessitated resort to passive resistance and hence he opposed Tilak's type of passive resistance.

In spite of their differences in politics, both Gokhale and Tilak had great respect for each other for the work they were doing for the country. Tilak attended the funeral of Gokhale and made a stirring speech. He also paid his tribute to Gokhale in the next issue of the Kesari in these words: "This diamond of India, this giant of Maharashtra, this prince of workers, is laid to eternal rest. Look at him and try to follow in his footsteps." Gokhale also paid a similar compliment to Tilak in these words, "Although I do not approve of his methods, I never question his motives. Believe me, there is no man who has spent so much for the country; there is no man who has had in his life to contend against the powerful opposition of Government so much as Tilak; there is no man who has shown grit and patience and courage, so rare that several times in the course of these struggles he lost his fortune and by his indomitable will put it all together again".

Tilak and Mahatma Gandhi

Both Tilak and Mahatma Gandhi belonged to the masses. Both of them were ascetics and altruists. Both of them possessed phenomenal energy and were fearless. Both of them were effective speakers and appealed to the masses. Both loved the Gita. While Gandhiji was called Mahatma, Tilak was called Lokmanya. While the models for Gandhiji were Christ and Buddha, the model for Tilak was Lord Krishna. Gandhiji was respected both by the people and the Government, but Tilak was the most hated man in India by the bureaucrats, feared by the Moderates and suspected by the Muslims. How-

ever, their methods differed. Gandhiji would say, "My method is not Tilak's method". Tilak made people fearless and self-respecting. Gandhiji turned the people against the Government in his own way. Tilak said that he worked within the law but Gandhiji said that he wanted to break oppressive laws. Tilak touched on the problem of the untouchables when it was inevitable but Gandhiji had in his Ashram an untouchable family. Tilak opposed the Age of Consent Bill. Gandhiji said that any sensible legislation in the direction of raising the age of consent would have his approval. Gandhiji assessed more correctly the urgent necessity of the abolition of untouchability, education of women, the removal of the grievances of the non-Brahmans and the improvement of the lot of the working classes. While Tilak was a scholar-statesman, Gandhiji was an ascetic statesman. While Tilak enriched the Marathi language, Gandhiji enriched the Gujrati language.

Tilak was a realist in politics. He wanted to act in a manner that his opponents could not take advantage of him. His view was that in this world of stern realities, one cannot afford to be entirely mild and meek in spite of the fact that the circumstances demanded otherwise. Even God is harsh sometimes. If some one gives a slap on your cheek, you have to retaliate, but it should not be done out of self-interest or conceit. This does not mean that Tilak believed that everything is fair in politics. He did not advocate force or diplomacy, but if his opponent was taking recourse to them, he would not forbid their use in return. The democratic realism of Tilak was different from the ethical absolutism of Gandhiji. Tilak was inspired by the teachings of the Mahabharata and the other religious books of Hinduism, but Gandhiji was influenced by the Sermon on the Mount, Ruskin, Thoreau, Tolstoy etc. Gandhiji believed in the immutability and universality of the creed of Ahimsa. Tilak believed in Ahimsa as a matter of policy but Gandhiji actually believed in it with his whole heart.

Both Gandhiji and Tilak had faith in Hinduism. However, the condemnation of Western civilisation by Gandhiji is more radical than that of Tilak. Tilak condemned some of the defects in English education but conceded that it had served the national cause. Gandhiji condemned the foreign system of education in India. The concept of non-cooperation was formulated by Gandhiji but its roots can be traced to Tilak.

While Gandhiji was a Mahatma and Dharmatma, Tilak was a Karma-Yogi and Rajapurush. While Tilak would sometimes condemn Gokhale, Gandhiji went to the extent of praising M. A. Jinnah.

While Tilak believed in realism, Gandhiji insisted on ethical consistency. This difference was apparent in their disagreement over the issue of Council-entry in 1919 and 1920. Tilak believed that a partial gain should be used to the best political advantage and advocated that the Reforms of 1919 should be accepted but the Congress should fight for more advance. Gandhiji did not accept that view. When Non-cooperation became the issue, Tilak agreed with Gandhiji to undertake a national Non-cooperation movement if that step was feasible but urged that it was politically wise to cooperate to the extent of entering the Councils and carry on non-cooperation there. The view of Gandhiji was that such a dual policy lacked ethical consistency and the Congress either must accept the Reforms and cooperate or reject the Reforms and non-cooperate in all respects. He did not consider it ethi-

cally sound to follow the middle course of responsive cooperation. Later on, Gandhiji had to realise that Council-entry was not an ethically unsupportable proposition and as a matter of fact gave his approval to the Swaraj Party which fought the elections in 1923 and 1924. The Congress also fought the elections in 1937 and 1946. That vindicates the stand of Tilak. The apparent difference between the political realism of Tilak and ethical consistency of Gandhiji was resolved in course of time and it was found that cooperation, non-cooperation, limited cooperation and responsive cooperation were all necessary as techniques in the struggle for freedom.

Another difference was between the conservative political expectations of Tilak and the initially enthusiastic expectations of Gandhiji. The attitude of Tilak was founded on years of political struggle that resulted in an attitude of mature political judgement. Gandhiji had very great expectations from the Non-Cooperation movement and he assured the people of India that he would get for them Swaraj within one year. With that object in view, he started the Non-Cooperation movement with his insufficiently trained and inadequately organised followers and the result was the tragedy of Chauri Chaura and the suspension of the Non-Cooperation movement.

While Tilak had militant realism and realistic means, Gandhiji had idealism and idealistic means. It is true that in his own way Tilak was a great idealist and he put before the people the ideal of Swaraj as a moral imperative. He fought relentlessly for Swaraj and had to pay a very heavy price. He subordinated everything to Swaraj. Gandhiji was an idealist and his idealism was very much influenced by Western concepts borrowed from men like Tolstoy, Ruskin and Thoreau and the Indian heritage of the Jains and the Buddhists. Gandhiji appeared to seek not only some moral justification for starting the Non-Cooperation and Civil Disobedience movements but also devoted himself to idealistic means. He constantly denied the utility of violence on the ground of morality. The view of Tilak was that the British rule in India was itself immoral and no other justification was required to fight against the bureaucracy in India.

Both Tilak and Gandhiji based all their actions on their love of the country, love of God and love of mankind. Both of them fought for a revolution, but a non-violent revolution. The means chosen by them were usually identical. Gandhiji put emphasis on Ahimsa. Tilak put emphasis on passive resistance which was the realistic method of political action.

Both Tilak and Gandhiji loved India passionately. Tilak was always a nationalist first. To him, India was the Mother for which he demanded sacrifices from the people and also sacrificed himself. The actions of Gandhiji were motivated by humanitarian considerations. He realised that what he did for humanity was of value to the extent that he acted for India.

While Tilak was a national leader, Gandhiji was an international leader. Though each had a world message, it was for India and for the people of India that both lived, worked and died. Each dedicated himself to a universal and eternal philosophy of life.

Both of them relied upon the people, their wisdom and their willingness to act. They sought to unify the people by stressing the common bonds that united them. They taught the people that Swaraj could be achieved by united popular action based on courage, born of self-reliance and dedicated to the common goal.

Tilak and Aurobindo

Both Tilak and Aurobindo were contemporaries. Both of them belonged to the Extremist Party. Both of them had admiration for each other. Aurobindo regarded Tilak as an intellectual giant and a great nationalist leader. Tilak also had similar feelings towards Aurobindo. In January 1908, Aurobindo visited Poona and delivered a speech in the Gaikwad Wada which was the residence of Tilak. On January 29, 1908, Aurobindo gave a lecture on the meaning and significance of Bande Mataram and Tilak alongwith his colleagues was present in the meeting.

It is true that both Tilak and Aurobindo were Extremists but there were certain differences between their ideas. We find the concept of Kali in Aurobindo as the spirit of time. He also regarded God as the captain of the nationalist movement. He had a passion for metaphysical abstractions and theological symbols. When he was released from Alipore jail, he declared that Sanatan Dharma itself was nationalism. On the other hand, Tilak was a realist. He did not put emphsis on the vision of the spiritualised society. Aurobindo was inspired by the teachings of Bankim Chandra Chatterjee and regarded the country as the Mother. On the other hand, Tilak was influenced by the character and personality of Shivaji and Nana Phadnavis.

Tilak put emphasis on the psychological conception of nationalism and considered a feeling of common belongingness essential for a nation. The view of Aurobindo was that nationalism was a pure and Sattvik religion.

Tilak put all the emphasis on Swaraj and considered everything subordinate to it. He considered Swaraj as essential for freeing India from the evils of the British bureaucracy in India. The view of Aurobindo was that the political salvation of India was essential for the spiritual redemption of mankind.

Tilak was a realist in Indian politics and while he put Swaraj as the goal, he was prepared to accept Home Rule within the British Empire. On the other hand, Aurobindo stood for complete independence. Aurobindo was opposed to the imposition of the Western civilisation on India. After the Calcutta Congress in 1906, Tilak declared, "As an ideal, independence is all right but you cannot work for it without bringing yourself within the clutches of law. Working for it will be waging war against the King." In his speeches and writings, Tilak avoided the use of the word independence but the Government of India knew that Tilak was its greatest enemy and he really stood for the emancipation of his country from the foreign yoke.

Both Tilak and Aurobindo advocated passive resistance. Tilak considered Swadeshi and boycott as the technique of passive resistance. Aurobindo had a more comprehensive view of passive resistance. According to him, passive resistance also included resistance to every unjust law or unjust decree in a peaceful manner. He was not contented with preaching Swadeshi and boycott.

Tilak and Swami Dayanands

Both Tilak and Swami Dayananda were great Sanskrit scholars. Both of them loved their country and were unhappy about the political, social and economic conditions prevailing in the cuntry. Both of them stood for

the liberation of their country from foreign yoke. Both of them used the word Swaraj in their writings and speeches, although Swami Dayananda was the first to use it. There were also differences in their conception of Swaraj. By Swaraj, Dayananda implied full autonomy or independence. Being a realist, Tilak equated Swaraj with some form of self-Government as prevalent in the colonies of the British Empire. That also was the objective of the Home Rule League started by Tilak.

Dayananda did not use the word Swaraj in any moral or spiritual sense. On the other hand, Tilak referred to the moral meaning of Swaraj as the virtue of the soul.

Swami Dayananda was influenced in his political thinking by the Manusmriti. He stood for some sort of an organisation with the village as the unit. He also stood for some sort of monarchy. That was not the case with Tilak. Tilak was aware of the new political and economic ideas of Western Europe and was prepared to accept for India a position similar to that of the colonies in the British Empire.

Legacy of Tilak

The view of Dr. T. L. Shay is that Tilak left a monumental legacy to the Independence Movement. Gandhiji and other Congress leaders who came after Tilak, could build upon the works and victories won by Tilak and the other Extremist leaders. Largely through the efforts of Tilak, the Indepnedence Movement was victorious over stagnation and the spirit of orthodoxy. Tilak freed the people of India from lethargy and stagnation. He inspired them with a new goal of India, united, strong and capable of action and ultimate victory.

Tilak won the battle against the Westernizers and the imitators. He asked the people not to copy the West but look to their own history and heritage. The people found that by being true to the values of their own civilisation, they could face the challenge of the West much more successfully. The pride in their history and classical values made them self-reliant and enabled them to fight the battle of freedom.

Though Tilak led India in the struggle for its survival, he was not a dogmatist. It is true that he was against imitating the West for the sake of imitation but he was always in favour of learning anything and everything which could profitably be learnt by the people of this country. He was against British bureaucracy in India, but he respected Britain for all that was noble and progressive in British way of life. Though he suffered in the struggle against the British Government, he had no hatred or desire for revenge against the British.

Tilak transformed the Indian National Congress in such a way that it could be used as an effective instrument against the British Government. He changed the Congress from a debating and petition-presenting society into a society which demanded Swaraj as its birth-right and not as charity or generosity. He laid the foundation for the Congress becoming the greatest and largest political organisation in the history of India. He prepared the way for Gandhiji and Sardar Patel.

Dr. Shay maintains that Tilak and the other Extremist leaders must be

given credit for leaving a legacy of the techniques of struggle which resulted in final victory. The Congress under Gandhiji, Sardar Patel and Jawahar Lal Nehru must be indebted to Tilak and other Extremist leaders who first initiated and applied the weapons which were ultimately successful in winning freedom for India.

Dr. Shay further observes that of all the legacies of Tilak to the Independence Movement, the greatest legacy was his contribution to the political philosophy of the independence movement. It was Tilak and other Extremist leaders who first envisaged Swaraj in the classical Indian value system as the birth-right of the people of India. In the words of Aurobindo Ghose, "God has sent us into the world to fulfil Him by fulfilling ourselves in our individual life, in the family, in the community, in the nation, in humanity". Gandhiji and the independence movement after Tilak were guided by this great philosophy of politics. Swaraj was the goal of India and Swaraj was the legacy of Tilak.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Argov, Daniel : *Moderates and Extremists in the Indian Nationalist Movement*, Asia Publishing House, 1967.

Aurobindo, Sri : *Bankim-Tilak-Dayanand*, 1940.

Bhat, V.G. : *Lokmanya Tilak : His Life, Mind, Politics and Philosophy*, Poona, 1956.

Ghose, Shanker : *Political Ideas and Movement in India*, New Delhi, 1975.

Inamdar, N.M (Ed.) : *Political Thought and Leadership of Lokmanya Tilak.*

Karandikar, S.L. : *Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak*, Poona, 1957.

Kanetkar, M.J. : *Tilak and Gandhi : A Comparative Character Sketch*, Nagpur, 1935.

Karmarker, D.P. : *Balgangadhar Tilak*, Bombay, 1956.

Karunakaran, K.P. : *Indian Politics from Dadabhai Naoroji to Gandhi*, New Delhi, 1975.

Keer, Dhananjaya : *Lokmanya Tilak*, Bombay, 1959.

Parvate, T.V. : *Bal Gangadhar Tilak*, 1958.

Pradhan, G.P. and A K. Bhagwat : *Lokmanya Tilak—A Biography*, Bombay, 1959.

Ram Gopal : *Lokmanya Tilak*, Bombay, 1956.

Reisner and Goldberg (Ed.) : *Tilak and the Struggle for Indian Freedom*, 1966.

Shay, T.L. : *The Legacy of the Lokmanya : The Political Philosophy of Bal Gangadhar Tilak*, Bombay, 1956.

Tahmankar, D.V. : *Lokmanya Tilak : Father of Indian Unrest and Maker of Modern India*, London, 1956.

Tilak, B.G. : *Writings and Speeches*, Madras, 1922.

Wolpert, S.A. : *Tilak and Gokhale : Revolution and Reform in the Making of Modern India*, Berkeley, 1962.

CHAPTER XVI

Lala Lajpat Rai (1865-1928)

Lala Lajpat Rai was one of the foremost leaders of modern India. He played a prominent part in the political, social, religious, literary and cultural developments of his times. He was called "Sher-i-Punjab" (Lion of the Punjab). He earned a name for himself on account of his selflessness, fearlessness and love for his country. He lived a life of dedication and died while serving the cause of his country. To quote him, "To amass wealth was not the object of my life, to enjoy luxury was not my goal. To win official honours was not my ambition. My spirit yearned for things quite different from these. I wanted to sacrifice myself for my people and for my country as the moth burns itself on the candle flame." On his death, Mahatma Gandhi paid his tribute in these words: "Lala Lajpat Rai is dead; long live Lalaji. Men like Lalaji cannot die so long as the sun shines in the Indian sky." Again, "Lalaji means an institution. From his youth, he made the country's service his religion and his patriotism was no narrow creed. He loved his country because he loved the world. His nationalism was internationalism." Dr. J. S. Dhanki writes that "Lajpat Rai was an ardent and devout nationalist; his life is a rare example of selfless sacrifice and dedicated exertions in the service of his country." The view of Motilal Nehru was that Lajpat Rai was "a great man, a good man and true."

Lajpat Rai was born on 28 January 1865 and he died on 17 November 1928. He started taking interest in politics at an early age. Shortly before the Allahabad session of the Congress in 1888, he published his "Open Letters" to Sir Syed Ahmed Khan in which he challenged the view of Sir Syed that the interests of the Hindus and Muslims clashed and could not be reconciled. The letters created a stir in political circles and Lajpat Rai was given a warm welcome at the Allahabad Congress session. He also attended the Congress session in 1889. However, his interest in the Congress waned because he felt that the "Congress leaders care more for fame and pomp than for the interests of the country." He did not like the holiday aspect of the annual meetings of the Congress which he called "the annual national festival of educated Indians." He had no love for what he called "holiday patriots."

Lajpat Rai attended the Lahore session of the Congress in 1900 and called upon the Congressmen to devote more attention to constructive work. He still found the Congressmen involved in theoretical discussions and not willing to adopt a bold and constructive programme. Shortly after the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1901, he declared that the basic problems of India could not be solved by speeches or resolutions only. What was needed was that the people should be ready to make sacrifices for the cause of the country. He disapproved of the policy of mendicancy followed by the Moderates.

In 1905, Lajpat Rai went to England to do propaganda in favour of

India. On his return, he was fully convinced that the political salvation of India could not come from outside and the Indians had to fight their battle for freedom themselves. In 1907, Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh were arrested and deported to Mandalay Jail in Burma. Both the Moderates and the Extremists protested against the deportations and Lord Minto was forced to release Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh and both of them came back to Lahore on 18 November 1907.

In connection with the Surat session of the Congress in December 1907, Lajpat Rai played the role of a peace-maker between the Moderates and the Extremists. When in spite of his efforts the split came, he decided to remain with the Moderates and declared that he would continue to fight under the flag of old Congress. He continued his efforts to bring about a compromise between the Moderates and the Extremists. While he appealed to the Moderates not to expose the Extremists to persecution by the Government, he also appealed to the Extremists "not to be impatient on the slowness of age and the voice of practical wisdom."

In 1914, he went to England as a member of the delegation to do propaganda in favour of the Congress. He could not come back on account of the outbreak of the World War I. He came back to India in February 1920 after doing a lot of useful work in the United States and Japan. While in the United States, he tried to educate the Americans about the conditions in India. He wrote many pamphlets and books on different aspects of the Indian problem. Some of them are "Young India", "England's Debt to India", "Political Future of India" and "Problem of National Education for India." During his stay in the United States, Lajpat Rai came into contact with many Indian revolutionaries who asked him to join them but he refused on the ground that he had no faith in secret organisations and violent revolutions.

Lajpat Rai presided over the special session of the Indian National Congress held at Calcutta in September 1920 to discuss the Non-cooperation programme of Mahatma Gandhi. He himself took an active part in the Non-cooperation movement. He directed the Non-cooperation movement in the Punjab and also went on a tour of India to do propaganda in favour of non-cooperation. He was arrested along with Motilal Nehru and C. R. Das and sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment under the Seditious Meetings Act. He was released on 31 January 1922 but was re-arrested and sentenced to two years' rigorous imprisonment. He did not approve of the suspension of the Non-cooperation movement by Mahatma Gandhi. To quote him, "A political leader is like a General and no General can afford to be chicken-hearted. A General can denounce, degrade, even shoot such of his soldiers and subordinates as do not follow his directions and obey his orders, but he has no right to throw down arms and admit his defeat involving the capture of his army by the enemy simply because a few out of millions have disregarded his wishes." Lajpat Rai sided with C. R. Das and Motilal Nehru on the question of Council-entry. His contention was that those who were in favour of Council-entry should be allowed the "liberty of conscience and action." The elections in the Punjab in 1923 were virtually run by him for the Swarajists. He was himself elected to the Central Assembly in December 1925 and in January 1926, he joined the Swarajist Party. However, he was opposed to "uniform, continuous and consistent obstruction"

and the policy of indiscriminate walk-outs from the legislatures. He was in sympathy with those who advocated responsive cooperation.

When the Simon Commission was appointed, Lajpat Rai declared that he was "not going to associate with the Commission in any shape or manner." He wanted the boycott of the Commission to be irrevocable. On 30 October 1928, he led a mass demonstration against the Simon Commission in front of the Lahore Railway Station and he was brutally assaulted by the police with Lathis. The demonstration was peaceful and the police attack was unprovoked. At a public meeting held in the same evening at Lahore, Lajpat Rai declared that every blow hurled at him would be a nail in the coffin of the British Empire. He did not survive the assault for long and died on 17 November 1928.

Lajpat Rai possessed a towering personality. He was always active and restless. He never gave rest to himself and also did not allow others to have rest. He was brave to the extent of being reckless. Instead of running away from dangers, he invited them. His frankness was proverbial. He always spoke and wrote exactly what he felt. He lived a hero's life and died the death of a martyr.

Political Thought of Lajpat Rai

The political thinking of Lajpat Rai was influenced by many factors. He took a prominent part in the work of the Arya Samaj and that had a profound influence on him. He himself wrote thus: "....and all that was good and creditable in me, I owe to the Arya Samaj. It was the Arya Samaj that taught me to love the Vedic religion and to be proud of Aryan greatness. It was the Arya Samaj that linked me into the ancient Aryans and made me their admirer and devotee. It was the Arya Samaj that instilled into me love for my nation that breathed into me the spirit of truth of Dharma and of liberty. My organising capacity too I owe to the Arya Samaj. It was the Arya Samaj again that taught me that society, Dharma and country command our worship and that those shall inherit the kingdom of Heaven who make sacrifices to serve these."

Lajpat Rai was a serious student of Bentham and John Stuart Mill in his college days. He continued his study of Western political thought even when he was practising at Hissar. During his active public life at Lahore, he studied the latest and most progressive thinkers of that time both in the East and the West. He was immensely influenced by the life and speeches of Joseph Mazzini, the great patriot of Italy, who was regarded by Lajpat Rai as his political Guru. Lajpat Rai wrote thus in his biography: "I determined that all my life I would follow the teachings of Mazzini and serve my nation. I made Mazzini my Guru and so he continues to be to this day.... I read Mazzini's biography from cover to cover and I was moved by it far more intensely than I had been several years before by Babu Surendranath Banerjea's speech about Mazzini. The profound nationalism of the great Italian, his troubles and tribulations, his moral superiority and his broad humanitarian sympathies enthralled me."

Lajpat Rai was a widely travelled leader not only in India but also in England, the United States, Japan and other countries. He came into contact with all sorts of people and they must have influenced his thinking.

As an Extremist

Lajpat Rai was one of the Extremist leaders of his times. He laid the foundations of militant nationalism in the country as early as 1905 at the Banaras session of the Congress through his forceful advocacy of passive resistance. Dr. B. B. Majumdar writes, "It is seldom realised that amongst the nationalist leaders of India, Lala Lajpat Rai was the earliest exponent of militant nationalism in the country. He was the first spokesman of the doctrine of passive restistance." He believed that India could become free only "after going through a process of a violent political upheaval."

Lajpat Rai had no faith in the British sense of "fairplay and justice." His view was that the economic interests of India and England were opposed to each other. He did not believe in the efficacy of the policy of "prayers and petitions" followed by the Moderates. He also rejected the claims of benevolence of the British Government in India.

Lajpat Rai was critical of the Moderates on account of their excessive dependence on the British Government. They lacked vigour and striking power. Under them, the Congress became "a halting, half-hearted political movement, depending on the symapthy and goodwill of the very class against whom it is directed." Lajpat Rai tried to remove the spell of British bureaucracy in India. In order to do so, he suggested a radical change in the political programme of the country in whcih great emphasis was laid on self-reliance, courage and a spirit of defiance.

Lajpat Rai believed that the enslaved people could never love the land of their alien masters. According to him, those Indians who believed in the celebration of the Empire Day were "hypocrites who dragged Indian patriotism into the mire." He condemned those Indians who hankered after British honorary titles as "whited sepulchres full of rotting corruption; the symptoms and disease of the national organism, the morbid parasitic cells which develop mean selfishness and thrive on favouritism."

Lajpat Rai did not believe in the Providential character of the British rule in India. He wrote, "Chains are chains, no matter gilded. Can the wealth of the whole world be put in the scales over against liberty and honour ? What would it avail if one were to get the sovereignty of the world but lose his own soul ? A subject people has no soul, just as a slave can have none. Subjects and slaves are not even the masters of their bodies."

Lajpat Rai rejected the plea of British bureaucracy in India that the Indians were not fit to rule themselves. He believed that the Indians were not inferior to their Western counterparts in any way. To quote him, "The real question is the dread of power passing from the Britishers into Indian hands. It is that dread that is the dominating influence in the policy of the British Government in India."

Lajpat Rai was described as a more dangerous revolutionary leader by E. Maclagan, Chief Secretary to the Government of the Punjab, than Ajit Singh who was in the forefront of the agitation against the Colonization in 1907. Both the Viceroy and the Secretary of State regarded him as a "dangerous leader and a person who was in touch with the Extremists." Sir Denzil Ibbetson, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, recommended the deportation of Lajpat Rai in order to crush the agitation. While com-

menting on his deportation to Burma, Lajpat Rai remarked, "Do what you may to crush or kill it. Fear will give way to the desire of martyrdom and arrests will speed up the national awakening." These remarks show that Lajpat Rai was an Extremist who was not cowed down by the threats of the Government.

In 1914, Lajpat Rai praised the acts of terrorism as an expression of genuine passion for national liberty. He did not approve of the stand of the Congress to help the Government in its war efforts. He did not want the Indians to be mercenaries. He described the British rule in India as tyrannical and oppressive. To quote him, "The spread of revolutionary ideas and the development of the movement for independence will not be stopped. India has entered on a new phase, her sons have begun to feel that it is worthwhile to die in the cause of freedom. They die in order to show their countrymen the path to liberation."

Lajpat Rai did not believe in revolutionary terrorist methods. To quote him, "We are neither fit nor ripe for a militant revolutionary struggle. We want a revolution but not force or violence. Organise the middle class, the peasants and the workers. Follow Gandhiji."

Lajpat Rai stood for a revolution of mind and heart. He did not advocate revolution by force or violence. To quote him, "What we need is not violence but firmness, not vacillation but determination, not expediency and time-serving but principles and a revolution to stand by them."

Lajpat Rai was an Extremist in the sense that like other Extremist leaders, he advocated Swadeshi, boycott and national education. As regards Swaraj, he did not like Swaraj to come in stages at the sweet will of the rulers. He would like to achieve it through self-reliance and effective struggle. To quote him, "Mine is a religion of hope and faith. I believe in struggle—a righteous, stern and unyielding struggle." Lajpat Rai aimed at the extinction of the British authority in India. He wanted the Englishmen to remain as friends and allies and not as masters. To quote him, "We shall welcome cooperation. We shall welcome advice. We shall welcome guidance also in certain matters. But we shall resent patronage and dictation. We have behind us the grown wisdom of six thousand years at our back."

Lajpat Rai did not stand for complete independence. His immediate goal was the attainment of self-Government within the British Empire on terms of equality. He would have been contented if India was given "the same rights and privileges, no less and no more, which are at the present moment enjoyed by Canada and South Africa." A month before his death, he supported the demand for Dominion Status for India. His belief was that although Dominion Status would not make India independent at once, yet that would fulfil a feasible goal. Dominion Status would secure for India the freedom to remain within the Commonwealth or to quit at will. There was no fear of India being outvoted by the other members of the Commonwealth. Lajpat Rai believed that a declaration of complete independence as the immediate goal for India would make the rulers of the Indian states suspicious and there was every possibility of their joining hands with the British Government against the nationalist movement. Those states could also stand in the way of the political progress

in India. Moreover, India at that time was economically helpless. Any movement for complete independence would have made the Britishers more repressive and that would have demoralised the people. Lajpat Rai knew that complete independence would come only after a hard struggle and not at once.

Lajpat Rai wanted India to be economically independent and therefore he advocated Swadeshi in all respects. He went to the extent of equating Swadeshi with patriotism. According to him, the salvation of India lay only in Swadeshi. To quote him, "The spirit of Swadeshi ought to prevail in all departments of life, subject to the one condition that whatever they had to learn from the West in order to maintain progress and secure prosperity, they need not be ashamed to learn." Applauding the Swadeshi movement, Lajpat Rai wrote, "The Swadeshi ought to make us self-respecting, self-reliant, self-supporting, self-sacrificing and last but not the least, manly. The Swadeshi ought to teach us how to organise our capital, our resources, our labour, our energies and our talents to the greatest good of all Indians irrespective of creed, colour or caste. In fact, the Swadeshi ought to be the common religion of united India."

Lajpat Rai also advocated the use of the weapon of boycott. As a means of arousing among the people a militant determination to win Swaraj, boycott was very effective. It could strike at the political prestige of the Government and also serve as an effective economic weapon. The boycott of British goods was particularly appropriate as "the logic of losing business is more likely to impress this nation of shop-keepers than any argument based on the ethics of justice and fairplay."

Lajpat Rai strongly pleaded for a scheme of national education. To quote him, "To be Indians first, last and all the time, in all political and economic matters and in our relations with non-Indians, nationalism must be taught to our boys and girls by written and printed lessons as well as by word of mouth."

As an Extremist leader, he was particularly close to Lokmanya Tilak. To quote him, "Yet with all these differences, we had common political principles and almost common political ideals with a deep-rooted distrust in foreign rule and lack of faith in foreign help and in the sweet words and promises and pledges of British statesmen". Again, "Many things were done during that session of the Congress (Banaras 1905) which brought Tilak and me nearer each other and by which he became the acknowledged leader to the Extremist Party throughout India." During the Bengal partition movement, the bonds of unity were forged and continued unimpaired till the death of Tilak in 1920. Lajpat Rai, B. C. Pal and Tilak believed in and presented to the nation the political goal of Swaraj, the political programme of national education, Swadeshi and boycott and the political method of passive resistance. The Extremist trio collapsed after the death of Tilak. The relations between Lajpat Rai and B. C. Pal deteriorated to such an extent that the former criticised and condemned very severely the views of the latter on Bengal Hinduism. However, he continued to follow the political methods evolved during the days of Tilak. Lajpat Rai started the Tilak School of Politics at Lahore during the days of the Non-cooperation movement initiated by Mahatma Gandhi. Even during the Non-cooperation movement, his political methods remained the same as during the time of Tilak. Even during the days of Swarajist politics, Lajpat

Rai firmly held to Tilak's method of non-cooperation and non-violence. In one of his articles, Lajpat Rai explained how his relations with Mahatma Gandhi were very pleasant and cordial but "they differed widely in principles and programmes and even more so in temperament and behaviour." Again, "I have no faith in non-violence as a creed but I accept it as a policy best under the circumstances." Again, "Non-cooperation with the foreign rulers is the only right course for a subject people, but non-cooperation as a rigid programme for such a big nation with so much heterogeneity was doomed to failure. We are wedded neither to cooperation nor to non-cooperation. We must do what is best, practical and possible under the circumstances." When Lajpat Rai started his weekly journal, "The People", he criticised Mahatma Gandhi in his very first editorial in these words: "Melodrama and an excess of sentimentality have no place in politics. For some time we have been busy making experiments with schemes which could not possibly be carried out without an immediate radical change in human nature. Politics deals primarily and essentially with the facts of a nation's life and the possibilities of its progress in the light of that. Human nature cannot be changed in months and years. A campaign of political emancipation of a nation under foreign rule imposed and maintained at the point of bayonet cannot be based on the attempt to change human nature quickly. Such attempts are bound to fail and end in disastrous action."

The view of Lajpat Rai was that in the existing conditions and circumstances in the country, it was a folly to think of using physical force against the Government of India. That is the reason why Lajpat Rai did not join the Indian revolutionaries and maintained an attitude of "benevolent neutrality" between the British Empire and the Indian revolutionaries. Short of physical force, Lajpat Rai was willing to use any method, howsoever defiant, against the Government of India. His view was that "British laws have no ethics and according to the latest juristic theory, no binding force upon us. What is the aim and object of our life? What is the end we are striving for? The freedom of our country, its emancipation in order to constitute itself into a sovereign nation for the good of all the communities forming the nation, as well as for the good of the human race. The extent to which the British help us in the attainment of these objects is the measure of our loyalty to them. Even under a national Government, there is always a limit to the desire for peace and order. These laws are made by them and in the interest of their rule. We or our people were no party to their making. Consequently, these laws have no moral claim on our allegiance." Lajpat Rai believed that "civil disobedience is based on truth and on a sense of duty. It is a fundamental right." As a statesman, the view of Lajpat Rai was that every step in the struggle for country's freedom was to be taken at the appropriate time and every time was not appropriate for starting non-cooperation movement or civil disobedience movement.

Dr. Pattabhi Sitaramyya writes that Lajpat Rai "was a fighter but not a Satyagrahi." He did not believe in the creed of non-violence although he admitted the need to remain peaceful. He adopted peaceful methods as a matter of political necessity and not of faith. According to him, "Ethics aside, the policy of using violence or force to oust the British from India is foolish. I am not in favour of taking insults, individual or na-

tional, in the spirit of meek submission but I am strongly convinced of the futility of force for our national purposes."

Indian Nationalism

Lajpat Rai was a great natioanlist leader. His nationalism was similar to Italian nationalism. His view was that every nation possesses the fundamental right to cherish some ideals and any interference with that right is unnatural and unjust. He called upon the people of India to cultivate the habit of patriotism among themselves. To him, patriotism "meant an intense love of liberty and justice and was a matter of self-respect. It was a powerful feeling which emanated from the heart and its intensity gave it the loftiness of a vision. This feeling was supported by a convincing theory of nationalism deriving its inspiration from India's past."

In his book entitled "Young India" published in 1916, Lajpat Rai gave an account of the Indian national movement. In his book entitled "Unhappy India", he explained how India was being exploited by the Government of India. He described the Revolt of 1857 as a political national revolt. He emphasized the fact that the sapling of freedom in India was nurtured by the blood of martyrs. He called upon the youth of India to give up their lethargy and liberate their country from the hands of the foreigners. To quote him, "Rise up, Young India, you are inferior to none. I therefore beg of you, youngmen of India, your Motherland is at the present moment lying prostrate; prostrate because of your lack of faith in yourselves, in our people and in your country; prostrate because of your weakness of mind and weakness of character. Rise up your minds, enthuse yourself with electricity of self-confidence and self-reliance. And this race will rise phoenix-like and spread all over the world."

As a true nationalist, Lajpat Rai advocated the educational, social and economic uplift of the people of India. He wrote thus in "Political Future of India": "The end is freedom to live according to our own conception of what life should be, to pursue our own ideals, to develop our own personality and to secure that unity of purpose which would distinguish us from the other nations of the world, ensuring for us a position of independence and honour, of security from within and non-interference from without."

The view of Lajpat Rai was that historically, Indian nationalism was inspired by European nationalism. The Indian nationalists learnt about "the struggles and successes of the English proletariat, the sufferings and the eventual triumphs of French revolutionalists, the efforts and victories of the Italians, the continued struggles of Russians, Poles, Finns, Hungarians and others." The other world events left a strong imprint on their thinking. They were also influenced by great figures like George Washington, Cavour, Mazzini, Bismarck, Kossuth, Parnell etc. The same was true of the influence of Maharana Pratap, Shivaji, Guru Govind Singh, Tipu Sultan, Rani of Jhansi etc. The rise of Japan and its victory over Russia in 1905 gave encouragement to the Indian nationalists. Lajpat Rai wrote, "The most prominent of these characteristics is the intense patriotism of the Japanese, a patriotism for which there is no parallel in the history of the world."

Lajpat Rai believed that the new spirit of nationalism was taking

firm roots in India and was changing the immobility of the Indian masses into a dynamic force. To quote him, "No amount of official terrorism and no devices, invented or followed to inculcate loyalty, can stop or check the flow of the new feeling of patriotism and nationalism which is being constantly felt by the sentences of death and transportation that the British courts are passing on beardless youths."

Lajpat Rai had full faith in the greatness of India and her people. He believed that the nation was superior to the state. He wanted to see India as a united and integrated country, devoid of communal and religious differences. He wanted to curb parochialism, provincialism and individual selfishness. He put all the emphasis on patriotism or Deshbhakti. To his mind, nationalism could not last long without every one being fully patriotic. "Genuine and selfless devotion 'Bhakti' for our Desh ought to be the Dharma, the noble mission of life, of every one of us and in the service of our country we should spare neither money nor life."

The patriotism advocated by Lajpat Rai was not one which taught the people to hate other countries. He wanted the Indians to imbibe the right spirit of nationalism. To quote him, "I am sure Indian nationalists do not want to set up aggressive nationalism of the kind which will breed contempt or hatred of other nations. The idea that love of one's country necessarily involves hatred of others, or even indifference to the welfare of the rest of mankind, is absolutely fallacious and mischievous.....We love our country because that, and that alone, can enable us to ascend to the heights of humanity." Again, "Mazzini's famous dictum of cosmopolitanism and nationalism should never be forgotten. Intense and devoted patriotism is quite consistent with the love of humanity. We should spare no pains to point out the cooperative nature of our patriotism and the analytical dangers of a loose cosmopolitanism."

The patriotism preached by Lajpat Rai was comprehensive enough to include the material, physical and even religious aspects of national life. He repudiated the two-nation theory. He believed that India was one nation and there were no fundamenal differences regarding colour, caste, creed, vocation or religion. He ruled out race conflict in India because "Hindus, Musalmans and Christians are all a racial mix-up." He did not deny the possibility of a religious conflict but he believed that communal discord was "more artificial than real, manufactured quite recently by interested parties.....Even when bona fide, it was due to false ideas of religious nationalism and communal patriotism." According to Lajpat Rai, Hindu-Muslim unity was the touchstone of Indian nationalism. To quote him, "If Mother India is proud of a Nanak, she is also proud of Chishti. If she had an Asoka, she had an Akbar too. If she had a Chaitanya, she had Kabir also. She can as well be proud of her Khusroes, Faizis, Ghalibs as she can be of Valmiki, Kalidas, Tulsidas. Even we modern Indians can as well be proud of a Hali and Iqbal, a Mohani as of a Tagore, Roy and Harish Chandra. We are as proud of Syed Ahmed Khan as of Ram Mohan Roy and Dayanand."

Lajpat Rai tried to pull down all barriers, including social and religious, in the path of Indian nationalism. According to him, "The Indian nation, such as it is or such as we intend to build, neither is, nor

will be exclusively Hindu, Muslim, Sikh or Christian. It will be each and all. That is my goal of nationalhood."

Democracy

Lajpat Rai was personally inclined towards democratic institutions. His view was that democracy was not at all foreign to India although she did not have the type of representative democracy which was in vogue in modern Europe. He believed that democratic institutions depended on the right of the people to express their will in the management of their affairs and such institutions had always been there in India.

According to Lajpat Rai, the best definition of democracy was given by President Abraham Lincoln as "the government of the people, by the people, for the people." According to him, the test of real democracy was in giving every person the right to equality regardless of sex, creed, colour or race. Lajpat Rai wanted the fullest participation of the people in the process of government as that was the only proper way of working of democracy. Political power was not the monopoly of anybody. The changing circumstances must result in the change of leadership in society. His concept of leadership for India was that of a band of devoted political and social workers living like the common people, sometimes working with their hands for their living and sharing with the common people their thoughts, their anxieties and their troubles. To quote him, "We want leaders who will not make false or equivocal defence whenever the authorities choose to prosecute them. We want leaders who will not be afraid to attack and criticize the men of property, power and privilege among the countrymen as fearlessly and mercilessly as they do the foreign exploiter, who will realise and preach that what they want is real democracy."

Not a Hindu Revivalist

It is true that Lajpat Rai was an Arya Samajist. He took pride in Hindu civilisation and culture. He was very much hurt when the interests of the Hindus were ignored either by the Government or by the Congress. He did all that he could to protect the interests of the Hindus. When separate electorates were introduced for the Muslims after the Minto-Morley Reforms of 1909, Lajpat Rai could not resist accusing the Congress for ignoring the interests of the Hindus. The Muslims were a minority in India but they were a majority in the Punjab. Hence it was necessary that the interests of the Hindu minority in the Punjab be safeguarded. In the Punjab Hindu Conference held in December 1909, Lajpat Rai asked the Hindus to close their ranks first and cease to raise "the parrot cry of Indian unity." He declared that "in the present struggle between Indian communities, I shall be a Hindu first and an Indian afterwards." However he also declared that "political salvation of India must come out of a combination and union of all communities into one national whole." When the Arya Samaj was pitched against the Muslims in 1911, Lajpat Rai set up the Hindu Elementary Education League which stood for promoting the study and use of Hindi. In 1924, there was a riot at Kohat in which about 150 Hindus were killed or wounded and the entire population of 4000 Hindus had to be evacuated to Rawalpindi for safety. Lajpat Rai did not agree with Mahatma Gandhi that the Hindus of Kohat should have died defending their lives and temples and they were cowards for not doing so.

Lajpat Rai was the President of the Hindu Mahasabha at its Calcutta session in 1925. He laid down a programme and policy for the Sabha to organise Hindu Sabhas throughout the country, to provide relief to such Hindus who needed help on account of communal riots, to reconvert Hindus who were forcibly converted to Islam, to organise gymnasiums for the use of Hindu youngmen and women, to organise Seva Samities, to popularise Hindi, to request the trustees and keepers of Hindu temples to allow halls attached to the temples where people may gather to discuss matters of social and religious interest, to celebrate Hindu festivals in a manner which may be conducive to the promotion of brotherly feelings amongst the different sections of the Hindus, to represent communal interests of the Hindus in all political controversies, to encourage Hindu boys to take to industrial pursuits, to promote better feelings between Hindu agriculturists and non-agriculturists, to better the condition of Hindu women and to promote good feelings with Mahomedans and Christians. In October 1928, Lajpat Rai presided over the U.P. Hindu Mahasabha Conference at Etawah. In his Presidential address, he supported the Nehru Report and advised the Hindus to accept it.

Lajpat Rai was genuinely interested in safeguarding the legitimate interests of the Hindus. However, in pursuing this aim, he was not opposed to the just rights and privileges of the Muslims. He was opposed to separate electrorates as he was convinced that ultimately they would be against the higher interests of the country as a whole. Dr. Dhanki writes, "His opposition to communal representation on the basis of separate electorates stemmed from his conviction that this would hinder the growth of nationalism and political emancipation of the country."

If Lajpat Rai favoured a policy of firmness, it was in relation to both the Hindus and Muslims and not exclusively in relation to one of them. If he criticized the Muslims, he also criticized the Hindus. He condemned in strongest possible terms the evils of caste system and untouchability. He was against partition and yet he put forth the scheme because he was absolutely convinced that ultimately the policy of communal representation will result in the partition of the country. It is not fair to suggest that Lajpat Rai propagated the scheme of partition. He wanted to avoid the partition and tried his best to find a solution of the Hindu-Muslim problem and ultimately suggested his scheme as the only way out of the difficulty. He was critical of the policy of appeasement for solving the communal differences. What Lajpat Rai wanted was not appeasement but firmness in resolving communal problems fearlessly. In his concept and philosophy of nationalism, communalism had no place at all.

Lajpat Rai himself explained how he differed from Tilak because "he was an orthodox revivalist. I am a social reformer. He was a Pucca Sanatanist; I am an Arya Samajist." In his letters to Sir Syed Ahmed Khan, Lajpat Rai said that "our English education, the study of eminent European minds and European sciences—alas, that you cannot feel this has expanded our souls and we can no longer be selfish 'Sat Bachina' prodigies of your oriental language." In one of his articles, Lajpat Rai discussed the difference between the Reformist and Revivalist schools of thought and concluded, "On our part we here in the Punjab are prepared to take our inspiration from both these sources though we prefer to begin with the latter and call in the assistance of the former mainly to understand and explain what

is not clear and ambiguous in the latter." Actually, his view was that "the ancient civilisation of India is superior to the modern civilisation of Europe.....but Western civilization is a gigantic force and we cannot protect ourselves from its advancing march."

Lajpat Rai put emphasis on widening the mental horizon of the people through a wider contact with the world at large. A life of isolation was a liability in the modern world of change and development. To quote him, "The attempt to live with the past is not only futile but even foolish. What we need to take care of is the future." Living in the past did not allow the Indians to cultivate a spirit of adventure.

Lajpat Rai had great respect for the ancient Aryans and was proud of their achievements, but, to quote him, "I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that the world has since then advanced much further in knowledge. And if knowledge is wisdom, then we must presume also that the world is wiser today than it was three thousand years ago."

In the light of these facts, it cannot be said that Lajpat Rai was a rank revivalist. As a matter of fact, he was a critic of revivalism if that meant meaningless attachment to the past. Lajpat Rai discouraged the teaching of Sanskrit and other ancient languages in the schools. He preferred the Western school and college system under which the boys and girls could be acquainted with the realities of life. Thus, Lajpat Rai defended the modern methods of education.

Lajpat Rai had no hesitation to admit the shortcomings in the ancient system of education in India. His view was that we must be always ready and willing to learn from every source. To quote him, "We shall welcome all aid, but we will depend on ourselves only.....We do not want to be English or German or American or Japanese; true, we want to be Indians, but modern upto date, progressive Indians, proud of our past and aspiring to a greater and nobler future."

Lajpat Rai was against traditionalism. He was not opposed to the spread of European languages, literature and sciences in India. To quote him, "Are we going to reject the sciences and the philosophy of the Western scientists and philosophers because the discoverers of these sciences and the writers of books on philosophy happened to be non-Indians? Are we going to reject Shakespeare, Bacon, Goethe, Schiller, Emerson, Whitman because they were not Indians? Are we going to discontinue learning the modern sciences of medicine, surgery, pathology, hygiene, engineering (civil, mechanical, electrical, agricultural and mining), botany, geology, zoology etc. because they were so much advanced from the things that we have in our literature on these subjects?"

Lajpat Rai started as a revivalist but he was almost transformed by the turn of the present century. He brought about a synthesis between revivalism and reform. He pursued reforms on rational and national lines. He was neither conservative nor short-sighted. He represented the spirit of militant nationalism which, with revivalism as its base, broadened the scope of social reform and "stimulated and re-enforced the reformer's belief that all groups in society must benefit from the advances that modern India was making." It did not retard the movement for social reform. It was "the re-assertion of the spirit of India."

Lajpat Rai had a modern outlook on family, society, religion and education. He had a thorough understanding of the East and the West. He was one of the front-ranking social reformers in India. It is not correct to say that in spite of his rational world outlook and economic philosophy, Lajpat Rai was also a Hindu revivalist. He can be called a revivalist in so far as he was a great admirer of the eternal truths contained in the Vedas, but at the same time he wanted "his people to look forward, not backward, to be realistic and not vaguely and ineffectively spiritual."

Unlike Tilak, Lajpat Rai did not believe that political freedom must come first and social reforms afterwards. His view was that social reform was as important as political liberation. According to him, social reform was to serve as a prelude to political freedom. In a way, Lajpat Rai adopted a line similar to that of the Moderates like Justice Ranade and Gokhale than to Tilak. It is suggested that this was due to his close association with the Arya Samaj which was primarily a reform movement in religious and social fields. Throughout his life, Lajpat Rai was engaged in social reform activities like widow remarriage, abolition of caste and untouchability and similar reforms. Like the Moderates, Lajpat Rai did not hesitate to use the machinery of the state to bring about social reform. In his reply to Mother India of Miss Mayo, Lajpat Rai regretted that "in India the reformers are working against heavy odds, for they have to contend against prejudice and ignorance without absolutely any help from the state. In fact, the alien bureaucracy have devised new methods of perpetuating the old system and making it subserve their own ends." However, he agreed with Tilak that "For us, it seems that the Indian problem is primarily a politico-economic one and one of social customs is only secondary."

It is rightly pointed out that the social reformist zeal of Lajpat Rai was inseparable from his ardent nationalist spirit. His views on social reform in India show that he was a rationalist, a progressive and a modern nationalist.

Socialism

After the end of the World War I, Lajpat Rai suggested that the Indians should adopt the aims of the British Labour Party and start educating the people on those lines. He also condemned the existing social order of Europe as vicious and immoral and wrote, "It is based on injustice, tryanny, oppression and class-rule; certain phases of it are inherent in our own system. Certain others were borrowed from our masters in order to make a complete mess." His view was that "what we want and need is not the power to implant in full force and in full vigour the European system but power to keep out its development on vicious lines with opportunities of gradually and slowly undoing the evil that has already been done." Again, "His (Marx) prognostications have turned to be so true in some of their main contentions that there is now practical unanimity among Western thinkers about the indescribable evils of the capitalist system."

However, Lajpat Rai was neither a Marxist nor a Communist. To quote him, "I am neither a Communist nor have I great deal of sympathy for the doctrine of Communism." According to him, the talk of the soli-

darity of the Labour Movement all the world over to the Indian workers is simply bunkum.....What the Indian worker needs is not dogma but help in oragnising and in the redress of his grievances against the Government and the employers. To feed him on the doctrines of communism or any other ism, to talk to him of international solidarity as if it had already been achieved, to ask him to throw himself into international controversies for international affiliation, is to lead him astray."

Lajpat Rai was disgusted with the British socialists when they supported Imperial Preferences. To quote him, "Militarism and capitalism are in the last resort the two pillars on which Imperial Preferences, like every other thing Imperial, is built. These are exactly the pillars which socialism is out to destroy. How on earth, then, can any one who calls himself a socialist support Imperial Preference?" That was the reason why Lajpat Rai decided that there was no possibility of an entente between the British Labour Party and the nationalist leaders of India. He told Pandit Jawharlal Nehru that he should not expect too much from the socialist forces in Britain because his own personal experience was not an encouraging one.

Lajpat Rai was not a doctrinaire socialist. He was a socialist in the sense that socialism was "a protest against the degradation to which the working part of humanity has been reduced by the unproductive leisured class." He explained his position in these words: "Our goal is real liberty. equality and opportunity for all." He agreed with the view that "If reduced to primary causes, all the conflicts originate from economic causes, the desire of profit and gain and power."

Lajpat Rai did not believe in the doctrine of class-war or class-antagonism. To quote him, "We do not want to cloister up classes.....We want to avoid, if possible, the evils of the class struggle. We will pass through the mill if we must but we should like to try to avoid it. For that reason we want freedom to legislate and freedom to determine our purpose in our demand for Home Rule."

Lajpat Rai did not subscribe to the theory of class-war and the final capitulation of capitalists before the proletariat. His motto was class-collaboration.

Lajpat Rai took active part in trade union activities in the country. As a matter of fact, he was one of the pioneers in that field in India. Along with N. M. Joshi and B. P. Wadia, he founded the All-India Trade Union Congress in 1920 and was also its first President. He represented India in the International Conference of Labour. He did not approve of the policy of the political parties using labour as a political weapon. His own view was that the workers were to be helped and educated for their own sake.

The view of Lajpat Rai was that the existing economic and social order was unjust and there was a wide gulf between the privileged and the underdogs. He stood for an "era of equal opportunity and equal justice to all." He had no faith in the system of free trade or the doctrine of Laissez-faire. He was a champion of the under-dogs, the tiller of the soil and the worker in the factory. His view was that "The Ryots and the working men in India and elsewhere are being exploited and robbed by the classes in possession of the means of production and distribution." He insisted upon the recognition of the right of every human being to a

decent living whether that living is made out of land or from industries.

Lajpat Rai supported the cause of the Indian farmers against the landed aristocracy. His own ideal was that every tiller of the soil should get "sufficient land or such tenure as will enable him to earn a decent and comfortable living." He was in favour of land reforms, including the distribution of land to the landless. He was in favour of proper ceiling on land holdings so that the land was owned and cultivated by genuine cultivators and not by absentee landlords.

Lajpat Rai's conception of socialism was different from that of the Western socialist thinkers. The reason was that his ideas were based on Indian realities and the Indian situation. Lajpat Rai accepted the economies of Khaddar and emphasized the necessity of a decentralised economic structure. It is pointed out that the Punjab Socialist Party which was founded after the death of Lajpat Rai, owed its intellectual origins to the views of Lajpat Rai and his friends and disciples.

Bolshevism

Lajpat Rai expressed his views on Bolshevism in these words : "Nobody knows what Bolshevism represents. The Socialists themselves are divided over it. The advanced wing is enthusiastic, the Moderates are denouncing it. The Liberals and Radicals are freely recognizing that it has brought into the affairs of men a new spirit which is going to stay and substantially influence the future of the world.....But we feel that only radical changes in the existing order will stem its tide. The Socialists and Radicals want to make the most of it while the Imperialist Liberals and Conservatives want to give as little as is compatible with the safety of the existing order in which they are supreme. The struggle will take some time, but that it will end in favour of the new spirit no one doubts. The only way to meet Bolshevism is to concede rights to the different peoples of the earth now being bled and exploited. Otherwise the discontented and exploited countries of the world will be best breeding centres for it. India must come into her own soon, else not even the Himalayas can effectively bar the entry of Bolshevism into India. A contented, self-governing India may be proof against it; a discontented, dissatisfied, oppressed India perhaps the most fertile field."

Proper Functions of Government

According to Lajpat Rai, it is the first duty of every Government to see that not a single member of the body politic suffers from the lack of clean and nourishing food, from want of sanitary housing and decent clothing. Every child of a mother, in so far as he is the product of natural impulses, shall get not only good food and clothing but also ample opportunities for education and development on its own lines. Every adult must contribute to the sum total of a nation's living. Every adult must engage himself or herself in some productive or creative work, whether physical or intellectual. Every member of society should get sufficient leisure to devote himself to the cultivation of the finer side of himself. Every one should have free access to land, air, water and other natural and artificial products, necessary to make a decent living and lead a decent life. No one should use another against his or her will by force or threat. Every

one should have an equal political status except when by common consent and for common purposes he or she is invested with a higher status for a temporary period. Every one is entitled to select his or her own habitat and membership in a social group provided he or she does not infringe the liberties or rights of others. Men and women are treated alike with rights and obligations differentiated only by their physical constitutions.

According to Lajpat Rai, "As schools must be provided by the state, so must the hospitals. But even more, the state must take measures not only to prevent the spreading of a disease but also to make its appearance impossible."

Lajpat Rai was essentially a man of action. He was a leader of the people. In the words of J. C. Wedgewood, he was "a hater of injustice and oppression, a living flame of which liberalism of all ages will justly be proud." Romain Rolland found in Lajpat Rai "the highest type of the Arya Samajist, the warrior, the knight, without fear and without reproach, who devotes his life to the defence of justice."

SUGGESTED READINGS

Dhanki, J.S. : *The Story of My Life by Lala Lajpat Rai*, 1977.
Ganesh : *Lala Lajpat Rai, The Man in his Words.*
Ghosal, J.C. : *Life of Lajpat Rai*, 1928.
Goyal, O.P. : *Studies in Modern Indian Political Thought*, Allahabad, 1964.
Great Thoughts of Lala Lajpat Rai : Albert Electric Press, Lahore, 1928.
Joshi V.C. (Ed.) : *Lala Lajpat Rai : Writings and Speeches*, Vols. I and II. Delhi. 1966.
Joshi, V.C. (Ed.) : *Lajpat Rai : Autobiographical Writings*, Delhi, 1965.
Lajpat Rai : *Young India*, New York, 1916.
Lajpat Rai : *India's Will to Freedom*, Madras, 1921.
Lajpat Rai : *Unhappy India*, Calcutta, 1928.
Lajpat Rai : *England's Debt to India.*
Lajpat Rai : *The Story of My Deportation*, Lahore, 1908.
Lajpat Rai : *The Story of My Life*, Delhi, 1965.
Lajpat Rai : *The Problem of National Education*, 1920.
Lajpat Rai : *The Political Future of India*, New York, 1919.
Lajpat Rai : *Ideas of Non-Cooperation and other Essays*, Madras, 1924.
Lajpat Rai : *The Arya Samaj*, 1915.
Lajpat Rai : *The Call to Young India*, Madras.
Lajpat Rai : *Mazzini*, National Book Trust, New Delhi, 1967.
Maharashtra State Lajpatrai Centenary Committee : *Lala Lajpat Rai : The Man in his own Words*, Bombay, 1965.
Majumdar, B.B. : *Militant Nationalism in India*, Calcutta, 1966.
Nagar, Purushottam : *Lala Lajpat Rai : The Man and His Ideas*, Manohar, 1977.
Purohit, B.R. : *Hindu Revivalism and Indian Nationalism*, Sagar, 1965.
Rolland, Romain : *Prophets of New India*, London, 1930.
Sahota, D.S. : *Lala Lajpat Rai : His Life and Thought*, 1974.
Shastri, Algurai : *Life of Lala Lajpat Rai* (in Hindi), 1950.
Suman, Ram Nath : *Lala Lajpat Rai*, Allahabad, 1965.

CHAPTER XVII

Bipin Chandra Pal (1858-1932)

Bipin Chandra Pal, popularly known as B. C. Pal, was "a man of mission with original and powerful political conception, an ardent nationalist of the first magnitude, a great publicist and a magnificent orator." Sri Aurobindo characterised him as "'one of the mightiest prophets of nationalism" and called him "perhaps the best and most original thinker in the country" of his time. He was a man of mission. He had an original and soul-stirring message to deliver to his country. If Sri Aurobindo was great as a writer, Pal was great as an orator. He has been described by Prof. Binoy Kumar Sarkar as "the Father of the Bengali revolution".

B. C. Pal was born on 7 November 1858 and he died on 20 May 1932. He was born in a middle class family in Sylhet (now in Bangladesh). He did not have high academic qualifications. He was an entirely self-made man. He worked as Headmaster of many High Schools and also the Librarian and Secretary of the Calcutta Public Library (now National Library). In 1876, he was initiated into the Brahmo Samaj by Pandit Shivnath Sastri and this organisation had profound influence on his character. He was inspired in his youth by Surendranath Banerjea, his political Guru. He started taking interest in politics in the eighties of the nineteenth century. He attended the Congress session held at Madras in 1887. At that time, he had great admiration for the British connection and faith in British fairplay and justice.

During 1898-1900, he visited England and America as a spokesman of the Brahmo Samaj. On his return to India, he started on 12 August 1901 his famous English Weekly, The New India. To begin with, it was intended to be a vehicle of cultural propaganda but later on it became the mouthpiece of resurgent Indian nationalism.

It is not correct to say that immediately after his return to India in 1900, Pal began to propagate radical political ideas in the country. The fact is that even after that, he continued to have faith in the justice, fairplay and generosity of the British. He shared the views of the other Moderate leaders in the Congress. The change came in his career in connection with the Partition of Bengal. To begin with, he opposed the Partition but when Bengal was actually partitioned in July 1905, he threw himself heart and soul into the anti-Partition movement and emerged as the greatest leader and architect of the national movement. Through his writings and public speeches, he delivered the new gospel of liberty. His eloquence had no parallel in those days. He infused into the boycott movement a dynamic and revoluntionary spirit. Although originally the boycott was intended to be an instrument of retaliation against British goods, it was developed by Pal as an all-comprehensive programme of non-cooperation with the British Government. He declared that the boycott movement was not merely an econo-

mic movement. It was also a protest against the British rule. He also declared that time had come to realise the utter futility of the policy of begging and petition-making before the Government. He advocated the policy of self-help in the political field for securing the natural rights belonging to the Indians.

Pal played a decisive role in the Partition agitation. He was considered as the arch-seditionist in India. He became the foremost exponent and leader of the Extremist Party in the country. He welcomed repression by the Government as that was bound to stimulate the patriotic feelings of the people. On 3 March 1906, he told a Calcutta audience that the hour for fine speeches had gone and time had come for action and self-sacrifice for the salvation of the country. In May 1906, he addressed many meetings on Swadeshi and national education and called upon the people to carry on the boycott of British goods and institutions. He condemned the demoralising policy of begging at the door of the Government. He preached the gospel of Swaraj or self-Government as the ultimate goal of India's political struggle. The issue of partition of Bengal went into the background and that of Indian Swaraj outside the British Empire came to the forefront. He declared that even if the Partition of Bengal was rescinded, the national movement was not going to stop until India got home rule in the true sense of the term.

In January 1907, Pal went on a propaganda tour travelling extensively in various parts of India. In September 1907, he voluntarily courted imprisonment in connection with the prosecution of the Bande Mataram. He refused to answer questions in the court on the ground that the prosecution was unjust. He was awarded 6 months' imprisonment. When he was released on 9 March 1908, he was welcomed by all the patriotic people in India. When Sri Aurobindo was arrested on 2 May 1908, Pal was invited to join the Editiorial Board of the Bande Mataram. He worked as Editor till August 1908 when he left for England.

Pal was in England from 1908 to 1911. There was a lot of change in his views. He declared himself against violent outrages and the efficacy of bombs. Instead of complete independence for India, he began to advocate co-partnership with Great Britain. He was oppressed by the danger arising from the rise of Japan on the one hand, that of China on the other and the emergence of the Pan-Islamic movement on the third.

After his return from England in October 1911, Pal became a Moderate. He welcomed the declaration made by Montagu, the new Secretary of State for India, on 20 August 1917 to the effect that India was to be given self-Government. However, when the Montagu-Chelmsford Report on Constitutional Reforms was published in July 1918, he attacked the same on the ground that the proposals made in the Report were disappointing.

Unfortunately, Pal came to have differences with Mahatma Gandhi. He did not support the Non-cooperation resolution moved at the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1920. He had his fundamental differences with Gandhiji on the question of non-cooperation, passive resistance and Civil Disobedience movements. To quote him, "Disobedience is easy to instigate, but exceedingly difficult to lay when the need of it is over. What the Indian leaders are sowing today, they will have to reap inevitably when they are charged with the responsibility of law and order themselves." This prophecy has turned out to be true.

As regards the differences between Pal and Gandhiji, Pal cared more for reason, intellect and scientific understanding than anything else, but Gandhiji put more reliance on faith, instinct and reverence. Pal was a non-conformist but Gandhiji was a conventionalist. Pal appeared before the nation to place his ideas so that the same might multiply themselves in the thinking and activities of the people. Gandhiji steadily drew the nation to himself avoiding the difficulties and seeking the broad levels of opinion. Both Gandhiji and Pal had their similarities in their adherence to moral and spiritual considerations in political beliefs. In their love of freedom, humanity and universal brotherhood and their timeless efforts to solve the differences between the Hindus and the Muslims. Both Gandhiji and Pal had the courage to face opposition while upholding their ideals.

Pal was a member of the Central Assembly from 1923 to 1926. As a member of the Assembly, he tried to set a high standard of parliamentary politics by remaining truthful to his political philosophy. He did not re-seek election. The years 1926 to 1932 were spent by Pal in isolation. That was due to his stubborn opposition to the politics of Gandhiji and the Swarajist Party. He found the doors of the nationalist press closed to him. When he died in 1932, his death was not noticed by the nationalist press. He had practically been forgotten.

Pal's Political Thought

The political thinking of Pal was an integral part of his quest for truth and freedom. In him, politics was linked with religion, with philosophy, with science, with all other disciplines. Various and different were the thoughts that went into the making of his mind. He had a total view of man and society. His political views were all-embracing and all-comprehending. He did not possess a narrow outlook. He was always eager to roam about the greater field of internationalism or universalism. He was basically a moral man. He felt so intensely to do the right that he had to feel convinced that he was doing the right. He was very much influenced by Raja Rammohan Roy, Iswar Chandra Vidyasagar, Shivnath Sastri, Bijoy Krishna Goswami and Aswini Kumar Dutta.

Nation

Pal believed in the organic concept of the nation. According to him, nation was not an agglomeration of separate individuals, coming into existence through a mechanical contract. It was neither a mere word nor abstraction. "It is something very tangible, something very concrete. It is both words and thought, both an idea and its symbol and manifestation—it is abstract and concrete. Its concrete elements are places and persons sanctified by noble historic association." "In a nation, the individuals composing it stand in an organic relation to one another and to the whole of which they are limbs and organs. An organism is logically prior to the organs. Organs evolve, organs change but the organism remains itself all the same. Individuals are born, individuals die but the nation liveth for ever."

Pal was in favour of sacrificing the individuals at the altar of the nation. To quote him, "We are born in this land. It receives us into its bosom even as our mothers do. It supports our life with its own substance even as the nursing mother supports the growing life of her own baby. This land is

literally the Mother of our physical existence. It is indeed the physical body of the soul of our land and nation."

Talking of the personality of the Mother, Pal wrote, "These mountains, these rivers, these extensive plains and lofty plateaus are all witnesses to the life and love of our race, in and through which the very life and love of the Mother has sought and found uninterrupted and progressive expression. Our history is the sacred biography of the Mother. Our philosophies are the revelations of the Mother's minds; our poetry and our painting, our music and our drama, our architecture and our sculptures are the outflow of the Mother's diverse emotional moods and experiences. Our religion is the organised expression of the soul of the Mother."

Nationalism

Pal was a champion of spiritual nationalism. He described the national movement in India as a spiritual movement. To quote him, "This new Nationalist movement in India is essentially a spiritual movement. The philosophy that stands behind it is the philosophy of the Absolute, the philosophpy of Brahman as applied to the interpretation of man's social and civic life." His concept of nationalism was not confined to the Hindus inhabiting India. It was secular both in its origins and implications. To quote him, "The sacred and the secular are strangely blended together in every department of the comparatively primitive life and activities of the people." Again, "The new India is neither Hindu nor Mohammadan, nor even British but is made up of the varied and valuable materials supplied in successive stages of its evolution by the three great world civilisations which the three great sections of the present Indian community represent."

Pal made a distinction between old and new nationalism. According to him, the old nationalism was of imitative character because the older generations drew inspiration from European and specially British history and literature. "The old patriotism therefore simply represented an awakening of the educated classes to a consciousness of their inferior position in the modern world. It was first the beginning of a reaction and not the birth of a new life." The new nationalism was realistic. It was fully appraised of the actualities of Indian life and thought.

Pal pointed out the fundamental difference between European nationalism and Indian nationalism. European natioalism put emphasis on territorial unity and Indian nationalism on cultural unity. The characteristics of European nationalism were economic conflicts, industrial competitions, greedy rivalries for the acquisition of unappropriated territories and the possession of unexplored markets. A nationalism of that type must become narrow, selfish, intolerant and aggressive.

Pal linked up his nationalism with internationalism. According to him, nationalism, to be true, must converage on internationalism. To him, nationhood appeared as the cradle of international brotherhood. Nationalism was necessary because "every nation must first and foremost of all be true to its own self. Its self may not be very pure or refined or noble, but whatever the state of progress or stage of evolution, it must, above all things, be true to the special laws of that state or stage. It is the loyalty of a nation to its own genius, its own nature, its own proper and true self."

Pal pointed out that his construction of the idea of nationalism was in consonance with humanity and internationalism. To quote him, "This patriotism had also become affiliated to universal Humanity which is symbolised by Maha-Vishnu or Narayana in orthodox Hindu thought. Bankim Chander Chatterjee is the discoverer of this new salvation—Bande Mataram and his symbolic presentation of the Mother is significant. Hence the essential and permanent form of the Mother rests eternally on the lap of Maha-Vishnu. This is her real form—the nation eternally resting in humanity."

The views of Pal on nationalism were influenced by Mazzini, Fichte and Hegel. He was proud to call himself a nationalist but the abiding force of his nationalism lies in the fact that it is radiated by the highest considerations of mankind and universal fellowship. Pal wrote, "The great mission of this ancient land and its composite people among the modern nations of Europe, Asia and America, is to replace existing international competitions by international cooperation, to substitute the arbitrament of peaceful consultations and reasonable compromise through an impartial international Supreme Court for the arbitrament of murderous arms, in the settlement of all international disputes and dfferences; and thus to help forward the realisation of the poet's dream of the millennium when the nations of the world shall be as One People, living at peace with one another, working together for the furtherance of the common good and the revelation of God in Man."

There was a change in the views of Pal after his stay in England from 1908 to 1911. He became a moderate of Moderates who wanted India to be tied to the apron strings of British imperial federation He came to believe that imperialism was a step towards internationalism.

Swaraj

As far back as September 1905, Pal supported the idea of political freedom for India on the Irish model, completely free from British control. When Dadabhai Naoroji declared in the Calcutta session of the Congress in 1906 that his aim was "self-government or Swaraj like that of the United Kingdom or the colonies", Pal came forward to oppose him. He opposed the idea of self-government of colonial type on three grounds. England would not treat equally with a non-white country like India as it would do with Australia, Canada and other white colonies. Surplus populations were being sent from England to the colonies which were for their mutual economic interest and exploitation and for strengethening the white race suzerainty over the distant parts of the globe. India could not be a party to such a system. Moreover, England would demand the control of the purse of the nation which was not in the interest of India. The result was that colonial self-government under British paramountcy might be a perfect ideal in theory but it was not a practical proposition. British overlordship in India will enable her to regulate and conduct the heart and nerve of the political life in India. According to Pal, a free India could become an ally of Britain but not a partner in the British Empire.

What was clear from his Madras speeches was that Pal stood for a sovereign independent India. It was for this reason that the British bureaucracy in India raised the alarm against his speeches which were considered to be a serious challenge to the British position in India.

Even in 1909, Pal wrote that colonial self-government is not substantially the same as national autonomy. It is an absolutely false ideal so far as India is concerned. There is the impassible colour line between the British and Indians. It is for this reason that the colonial ideal is a false ideal in India although otherwise it is substantially the same as national independence.

The view of Pal was that the term Swaraj was borrowed from the highest philosophical and religious literature of the people of India. The term is used in the Vedanta to indicate the highest spiritual state wherein the individual, having realised his identity wtth the universal, is not merely free from all bondage, but is established in perfect harmony with all else in the world. Pal also pointed out that while the term freedom is negative, Swaraj is a positive concept. To quote him, "The corresponding term in our language is not not-subjection which would be a literal rendering of the English word Independence, but self-subjection which is a positive concept. It does not mean absence of restraint or regulation or dependence but self-restraint, self-regulation or self-dependence. In fact, our self-subjection means a good deal more than whatever the terms self-restraint, self-regulation or self-dependence would convey in English. For the self in Hindu thought is a synonym for the universality. Self-subjection means therefore in our thought, really and truly subjection to universal. The complete identification of the individual with the universal in every conscious relation of his life, is thus with us an absolute condition—precedent of the attainment of freedom."

The Swaraj of India was to be the Swaraj of the Indian people. It was to be democratic swaraj. To quote him, "The ideal of Swaraj that has revealed itself to us is the ideal of divine democracy. It is ideal of democracy higher than the fighting, the pushing, the materialistic, the cruel democracies of Europe and America".

His Methods

Pal ruled out the use of force for the achievement of Swaraj for India. To quote him, "No one outside a lunatic asylum will ever think of or counsel any violent or unlawful methods in India, in her present helplessness for the attainment of her civil freedom." However, he pointed out that "if we may not oppose physical force by physical force, we may yet make the administration in India absolutely impossible by simply taking our hands off the machine of the state. By simply obeying the Government and submitting to its laws, but at the same time refusing to accept it as our own and therefore not entitled to our voluntary and honorary services, a refusal which is in no wise criminal, we can, we believe, bring this Government down on its knees far more effectively by absolutely peaceful means than we may ever hope to do by any violent measures. Our ideal is freedom, which means absence of all foreign control. Our method is Passive Resistance which means organised determination to refuse to render any voluntary or honorary service to the Government." Pal defined Passive Resistance as "resistance that is not active resistance, not resistance that is non-active, but non-aggressive resistance."

While advocating passive resistance, Pal did not deny the law-maintaining authority of the Government. Though he advocated non-cooperation with the Government for the attainment of legitimate political rights, it was

to be peaceful and non-violent in character and was intended to operate within the bounds of law. Through passive resistance, Pal tried to organise the moral and spiritual forces of the people to put pressure on the Government. It was in a way confrontation between the people and the Government, but it was a confrontation between a civic people and a civic Government. It was taken for granted that the two sides would remain within the respective spheres of their lawful rights. While resisting the demands of the people, the Government was to obey its laws scrupulously and not to transgress those primary rights of the people upon which all Governments are based and from which all state constitutions derive their fundamental functions. For this doctrine, Aurobindo called Pal "the prophet and first preacher of passive resistance".

Pal justified resistance to the state on the ground of natural rights. To quote him, "There are certain rights which Governments do not create, but rights which create Governments themselves. These are not constitutional rights; they are natural rights, the charter of which is received from no man but from Him who stands High and so long as the British Government protects uncreated rights of persons and property of individual Indian citizens, so long we shall respect their laws and our agitation shall be conducted along such lines".

Pal also advocated the method of boycott for the attainment of Swaraj. Originally boycott was intended to be an instrument of retaliation against British commerce in India. The idea of boycott was developed by Pal as an all-comprehensive programme of non-cooperation with the foreign Government. To quote Pal, "It (boycott) means that it shall move, move from point to point, move from city to city, move from Division to Division, move, I hope you will allow me to add, from province to province. In Bengal, we have not only tried to boycott British goods but so far as it may be a convenient phrase, all honorary association with the Government also. That is the meaning of boycott which will move from point to point until God knows where". Pal expected a boycotter to be guided by the highest social and moral obligations. His supreme concern was to protect and advance social well-being. Pal himself set an example in 1907 by refusing to give evidence or take an oath in the court in a case of prosecution of Aurobindo Ghose, as the Editor of the Bande Mataram. The result was that Pal was convicted for contempt of court and sentenced to six months' simple imprisonment.

Pal criticised the prevailing educational system in India and emphasised the necessity of national education which could be imparted through national schools only. He called upon the students of Bengal to come out of their schools and colleges in the wake of the partition of Bengal and thousands of students responded to his call.

According to Pal, "Swadeshism must associate itself with politics and when Swadeshism associates itself with politics, it becomes boycott and this boycott is a movement of passive resistance."

In his later life, Pal became a Moderate and he refused to support the programme of the Extremist Party. He also opposed the Non-cooperation movement led by Gandhiji.

Concept of Federalism

At one stage of his life, Pal was attracted by the idea of federalism. His view was that a unitary Government had an inherent tendency of a class rule. To quote him, "No centralised state especially when it has to direct and control the administration of so vast a country like India and provide for the defence of its extensive land border and sea border can help growing into a military power."

In 1907, Pal put forward the idea that the future Government of India will be a United States of India, consisting of the divided nationalities of India. He drew the idea of federalism as a philosophy from his studies in Hinduism. From his study of Indian national life, he came to the conclusion that politically the most fitting system of state-craft for India would be a federal and not a unitary one. To quote him, "India is not a homogeneous whole. There are very wide and fundamental differences in the culture and character of the different Indian provinces. These different provinces must form the different units of the future Federation or Confederacy of India. And if we shape and direct the course of our present political and historic evolution along this federal line and try to secure absolute freedom of provincial life for the different provinces, combining them into what has been called the future United States of India, we are likely to protect and develop along natural and rational lines the life and culture of the different provinces inside this All-India Federation. When we have been able to build up this National Federation or United States of India, the provincial legislatures will be vested with the complete control of provincial finance, provincial legislation and provincial administraton. The function of the Central Legislature and Executive will be strictly confined to such matters as concern the relations between one province and another, and the collective, political, military, or administrative interests of the continent as a whole."

Pal advocated not only complete provincial autonomy but also district autonomy. To quote him, "To secure real popular control over the provincial governments, these must be split into Districts and the Central Government in each province must also be federation of various districts." Pal did not like even the District Government to be a unitary Government. He suggested the setting up of District Parliament for the full government of the District. These Parliaments were to be responsible to their electors and elect their Executive at the District level. The District Executive was to be responsible to the District Legislature. Thus real democracy was to be achieved and centralisation and class rule avoided. The District governments were to be built upon a federation of village communities.

Concept of Imperial Federation

When Pal visited England and America in 1898-1900, he found in those countries a section of liberal statesmen advocating the concept of Imperial Federation as a just and practical political goal. In 1901 and 1902, Pal wrote that Great Britain was already moving towards a truly Imperial Federation in respect of white colonial countries but in respect of India, she was still being guided by a policy of domination and exploitation. Pal did not emphasize the idea of Imperial Federation during the days of the Swadeshi movement as that would have been suicidal for the nationalist cause. Those were the

years of protest and self-assertion which were essential to awaken a new self-consciousness among the people and to bring home to the British rulers of the country the supreme necessity of working out a reasonable reconciliation with the nationalist forces. During his stay in England in 1908-11, Pal was free from direct involvement in political activities and hence was able to devote more attention to the ideal of Imperial Federation. He found Great Britain recognizing South Africa, Australia and New Zealand as equal co-partners in the British Empire.

When Pal came back to India, he gave further attention to the idea of Imperial Federation. He wrote that "India furnishes a model of that Universal Federation, the Federation of the world" which humanity was aspiring for. The idea of freedom contained in Indian culture was a better one than that in Europe. "Where Europe talked of independence, India talked of self-dependence. Where Europe talked of freedom, meaning absence of restraint, India preached self-restraint. And the moment we realise this great inheritance of modern India in her ancient thought and culture, we are able to take up a platform immensely higher than any that the freedom movements of Europe have so far been able to rise to. The peculiar value and distinction of our concept Swadheenata (self-dependence) and Swatantrata (self-subjection) lies in the grandeur of the connotation of the word Swa or self. This Swa is both the individual and the universal self and the two are really one. To speak in the terms of the Trinitarian theology, the individual self and the universal self are one Ouisia or essence, but different in hypostatis or appearance. And man's range of real freedom or self-dependence as we would call it, expands in proportion as he is able to realise his unity with the Universal self".

The view of Pal was that from the practical point of view, the future of Indian Swaraj was better assured through her membership of the Imperial Federation than through leaving her. To quote Pal, "If India is able to attain full freedom of self-determination and self-Government, as an equal partner in the British Empire, she will be able to control and direct, by her moral and spiritual influence not only the course of the imperialist evolution within the British Commonwealth of Nations, but also outside it. It will remove the fatal temptations of a revived temporal Empire of Islam from the Islamic populations of India and the Islamic peoples of the world. It will also offer an effective check to Japanese and Chinese imperialist ambitions while its influence even upon European politics and history will not be negligible. The British Empire means practically India materially today but when she enters into equal partnership with the Dominions and the United Kingdom in this Empire, India will mean the British Empire, normally and spiritually. And she will be able to curb and control the suicidal materialistic tendencies of this Empire. No imperialist enterprise will then be possible."

The view of Pal was that India had arrived at the parting of ways and Great Britain was going to give up her suzerainty over India in her own interest. Pal wanted Great Britain to maintain with India a fraternal connection of mutual interest.

If India joined the Imperial Federation, "all that will happen is that in the control of her and inter-Dominion policy and action, India like the other members of the Federation, will have to be guided by the

common voice of the Federal States. This Federation, when it is propely and finally constituted, will necessarily have its own Cabinet or Council of the Empire. In this Council of the Empire, India will have an equal place and an equal vote with representatives of Great Britain and the other self-governing Dominions. But submission to the decisions of the Federal Council in all inter-Dominion or international questions will not in any way destroy her title to sovereignty or her freedom except to the extent that every association does restrict individual freedom."

When India got Swaraj, the position of the British Parliament must change. "The Indian executive will be absolutely subject to the Indian legislatures, as the Indian legislatures will be entirely responsible to and removable by Indian constituencies. The attainment of real democratic self-Government or responsible Government in India must mean the ultimate transference of the authority of the British Parliament over Indian administration to the Indian legislatures".

From 1911 onwards, Pal was busy preaching his ideal of Imperial Federation. During 1915-18, all the leaders of the Home Rule movement in which Pal himself played an important role, conceived of India's political freedom within the British Empire. However, after the advent of Mahatma Gandhi, there was the cry of complete independence in Indian politics.

Pal on Democracy

Pal stood for a democratic form of Government. To quote him, "The constitution of a state must be so framed as to be able to bring out to the highest degree and in the largest measure possible within such limitations under which it may work, the essential divinity in its citizens. This is the fundamental philosophy of democracy".

Pal stood for universal adult suffrage. He suggested the reform of the existing system in India by giving the right of vote to more people. He was opposed to communal or separate representation. According to him, it was dangerous to categorise majority and minority in the political field on the basis of religious denominations. Pal's view was that there was no such thing as Hindu interest or Muslim interest. Democracy means the rule of the majority and the minority should frankly and willingly accommodate itself to the will of the majority which must guarantee the fundamental rights of the people. The reservation of seats on communal consideration "is an open denial of the right of the constituencies to choose whomsoever they please to represent in the legislatures. As such, this reservation cannot be accepted, either for the Hindus where they are not likely to capture many seats, or for Mohammadans for their inability to win the confidence of the electorate".

Pal advocated the creation of a strong civic consciousness among the people. Whether they were Hindus or Muslims or Buddhists or Christians, they must all feel that they were the members of a common civic society. The habits of democratic thought and life alone "can create and foster that sense of social solidarity upon which alone can we ever hope to build up a true democratic society and state." Pal's view was that a democratic character was necessary for the running of a parliamentary Government in the country.

Personally, Pal was in favour of grass-root democracy where the people themselves, free from political parties, would exercise their free will to choose the fittest candidate as their representative. As that was not possible in India, he stood for a two-party system in order to build up a viable representative Government in India. He was deadly opposed to the formation of coalition Governments by various political parties.

Pal for a Secular State

Pal stood for a secular state in India. He wanted neither Hindu hegemony nor Mohammadan hegemony over the Indian Continent. He had respect for all religions. "I am personally neither Hindu nor Mohammadan in the religious sense. From a larger view, I may honestly claim to be both Hindu and Mohammadan." Pal realised the dangers of theocracy and his remedy was a secular state for India. He pointed out that the modern state is a secular state and if we want a modern national state. we must get rid of the old theocratic ideas of religion. The injunctions of the religious scriptures of different denominations must under no circumstances be permitted to interfere with civic duties and responsibilities. These must be determined by civil laws only and enforced by the authority of the state. Neither the Manava Dharam Sastra nor the Srauta Sutras shall have any place in the laws and codes of the modern national state in India. No recognition shall be given to the Quran and the Islamic codes.

Socialism

During his stay in England from 1908 to 1911, Pal came into contact with the socialists. He wrote in 1909 that socialism represented the protest of European democracy against the existing economic arrangements of European society. It was a demand for a more equitable distribution of economic privileges. Though to a certain extent, socialism was anti-individualistic, it was in no sense a synonym for natonalism. Socialism was a recognition of the limitations of individualism in the economic sphere only. Nationalism recognised those limitations in every department of life. Socialism was a theory of economics while nationalism was a fact in sociology.

Pal was inclined towards socialism without being a socialist. Socialism attracted him on account of its economic principles and not as a higher philosophy. His view was that an equitable distribution of wealth, a high standard of social security and the curbing of monopolistic trends could be achieved through socialism. When he studied socialism in depth, he found certain difficulties. State socialism was absolutely fatal to the evolution of real democracy. He realised that state socialism meant the stranglehold of the state on the entire economy and complete dependence of the people on the state for their living and that was not beneficial for society. State socialism weakened and gradually destroyed individual initiative in regard to the affairs of the people. Pal admitted that socialism could remove economic inequalities and restrict exploitation and profits, but his fear was that excessive praise of socialism might ultimately prepare the stage for a Communist take-over in Indian politics. Hence, Pal accepted socialism with reservation. He preferred the Fabian form of socialism. He did not find much difference between socialism and popular communism. Both of them were hunger-born and envy-driven. They could not appeal

to the intellect, the conscience and the real social idealism of the cultured man. The conclusion of Pal was that the demerits of socialism outweighed its merits.

Pal wanted to rise above socialism. He was in search of a more rational and humanistic political philosophy. His ultimate conclusion was that a higher social order could be reached through the spirit of nationalism.

Pal condemned the spirit of competitive capitalism and he did not want India to follow it. He was opposed not only to industrial exploitation but also to industrialisation itself. He attributed the deterioration of ethical and moral values of life to modern industrialisation. To quote him, "We shall never be able to secure real freedom unless we are able to stop the onrush of this capitalism upon us and the most effective means of do ng it lies in the revival of our old village life. He named his socialism as Hindu socialism. He stood for higher wages for labour, a maximum of 48 hours of work in a week, equal hours of work for men and women, taxation on surplus profits in India and the appropriation of all excess profits by the state.

These socialistic views of Pal were opposed to his earlier views in which he advocated a policy of Laissez faire to be followed by the state. In order to enable the people to develop their Swadeshi enterprises in economic, industrial and educational spheres, Pal had advocated a policy of Laissez faire by which he meant that the collective indigenous potentialities of the nation should be allowed to grow uninterrupted by the Government. The Government was to maintain law and order in the country and leave the people to grow and organise their own forces.

Bolshevik Revolution

After the Communist Revolution in Russia, Pal had a very superficial knowledge of it and supported it on the ground that it championed the cause of the exploited and down-trodden. However, he changed his views about socialism later on. He was completely disillusioned with the Bolshevik revolution. He became cautious to keep India's political life free from its influence. He pointed out that the Communists had not kept their promise to make a new heaven and new earth. The New Economic Programme had failed in the Soviet Union. Pal did not have a high opinion of Lenin whom he compared with the Pope. He believed that the induction of a proletarian movement of Communist design in India would spell disaster, It would upset all moral and spiritual values of life as understood by the national genius and culture of India.

Fascism

Pal denounced Fascism as a positive menace to freedom and democracy. According to him, the domination of Italy by Mussolini was the domination of organised brute force.

The view of Prof. A. P. Mookerjee is that the legacy of the thought of Pal is traceable among those who played a prominent role in Indian politics in the succeeding generations. Fenner Brockway writes that Pal was "the new spirit of India incarnate". He found in Pal "the first prophet of the new Nationalist school." He was charmed by his philosophic method of

treating the subject and the clarity with which he described the development of awakening in India."

SUGGESTED READINGS

Haramohan Dev : *A Short Life-Sketch of Bipin Chandra Pal*, Calcutta, 1957.

Mookerjee, A.P. : *Social and Political Ideas of Bipin Chandra Pal*, Calcutta, 1974.

Mukherjee, Haridas and Uma : *Bipin Chandra Pal and India's Struggle for Swaraj*, Calcutta, 1958.

Pal, B.C. : *The Spirit of Indian Nationalism*, London, 1910.

Pal, B.C. : *Swadeshi and Swaraj* (The Rise of New Patriotism), Calcutta, 1954.

Pal, B.C. : *Memories of My Life and Times*, Vols. I & II.

Pal, B.C. : *The New Spirit : The Sacraments of National Life*, 1907.

Pal, B.C. : *The Soul of India*, 1916.

Pal, B.C. : *Indian Nationalism : Its Principles and Personalities*, Madras, 1918.

Pal, B.C. : *Responsible Government*, Calcutta, 1917.

Pal, B.C. : *Nationality and Empire*, Calcutta, 1916.

Pal, B.C. : *The New Economic Menace to India*, Madras, 1920.

CHAPTER XVIII

Sri Aurobindo Ghose (1872-1950)

Sri Aurobindo was a great leader of men. He was a great sage, Yogi and philosophical thinker. Romain Rolland regarded him as the "prince among the Indian thinkers". Sir Radhakrishnan considered him as the "most accomplished of modern Indian political thinkers". Rabindranath Tagore hailed him as one of the "messiahs of Indian culture and civilisation". C. R. Das described him "as the poet of patriotism, the prophet of nationalism and the lover of humanity".

Sri Aurobindo was born on 15 August 1872 and he died on 5 December 1950. His father was an eminent physician who sent his son to England for higher studies at the age of seven. Aurobindo spent 14 years in that country. He had a brilliant academic career at the Cambridge University. In 1890, he passed the Indian Civil Service Examination but failed in the riding test.

He joined service under the Maharaja of Baroda in 1893 and remained there upto 1905. While in England, he had already decided to devote his life to the service of his country and her liberation. It was in pursuance of that objective that while in the service of the Maharaja of Baroda, Aurobindo began writing on political matters to awaken the nation. He wrote a series of articles entitled "New Lamps for Old" in the paper called Indu Prakash. The very first two articles created a sensation and frightened the Moderate leaders. Aurobindo not only criticised the then Congress policy of prayers, petitions and protests but also attacked the British bureaucracy in India. He openly declared that independence could not be attained through the charity of foreign masters. India must depend upon her own strength. The Congress must be made a mass movement.

Aurobindo was waiting for an opportunity to serve the cause of his country's freedom. Before 1905, the time for his active participation was not ripe as the Moderates were controlling the Indian National Congress and were not willing to make the Congress a mass movement. However, a change occurred in the politics of India by the Partition of Bengal by Lord Curzon in 1905. Owing to their disobedience to the circulars of the Government prohibiting students of Bengal from attending political meetings, a large number of students were expelled from Government institutions in Bengal. The national leaders took up the responsibility of educating them and with that object in view established in Calcutta the National Council of Education and also started the National College in Calcutta. Aurobindo resigned his post in Baroda and took over as Principal of the Calcutta National College. He held that post till 2 August 1907 when he resigned. In his farewell address to the students of the College, Aurobindo said, "There are times in a nation's history when Providence places before it one work, one aim, to which everything else, however high and noble in itself, has to

be sacrificed. Such a time has come for our Motherland when nothing is dearer than her service, when everything else is to be directed to that end. You will study for her sake, train yourself body and mind and soul for her service. Work that she may prosper. Suffer that she may rejoice."

While in Calcutta, Aurobindo worked hard for the independence of his country. His idea was to capture the Congress and make it an instrument for revolutionary action. He openly advocated non-cooperation and passive resistance. He advocated even open revolt all over the country. When the Calcutta session of the Congress was held in 1906, he played an important role on that occasion. He was also prominent at the time of the Congress split at Surat in 1907. On 19 January 1908, he addressed a huge public meeting at Bombay in which he declared that nationalism was a religion that had come from God, a divine, an immortal and invincible religion. He proclaimed his conviction that a Divine Power was behind the national movement in India which was bound to be successful. He was arrested on 4 May 1908 in Maniktola Bomb case (the Alipur Conspiracy case). He was prosecuted but acquitted on 6 May 1909. He again plunged himself into political activity. He started two Weekly papers, the Karmayogin in English and Dharma in Bengali and wrote a large number of articles on various aspects of nationalism in the country. In February 1910, he took a boat and went to Chandernagar and reached Pondicherry on 4 April 1910. He lived a life of retirement from Indian politics after that and died in 1950.

Sri Aurobindo was influenced not only by European thought but also by his study of the works of Bankim Chandra Chatterji. Much of his political outlook on individual conduct and national affairs was affected by his study of Bankim's Anand Math, Krishna Charitra and Dharma Tattva. From Bankim, he acquired the three-fold formula for moral strength: (1) sacrifice and devotion, (2) self-discipline and organisation and (3) religion of patriotism. He was also indebted to Sister Nivedita whose essay on Kali impressed him. Vishnu Bhaskar Lele, a Maharashtrian Yogi, also had great influence on Aurobindo. He spiritualised his life and completely changed the same. The study of the Gita also influenced Aurobindo.

The political thought of Aurobindo can be studied from a large number of books written by Aurobindo and the names of some of them are The Human Cycle, The Ideal of Human Unity, The Ideal of the Karmayogin, The Doctrine of Passive Resistance, Defence of Indian Culture, the Renaissance in India, Basis of Yoga, Riddles of the World, Synthesis of Yoga, the Life Divince etc.

Aurobindo on Congress

Aurobindo had great love for the Congress as an institution but he criticised the Congress as it was under the domination of the Moderates. His view was that the Moderate leaders of the Congress did not adopt a clear-cut goal of national freedom and wasted their time in trifles which did not meet the requirements of the situation. The result was that the Moderates failed to achieve much. They adopted a wrong approach towards the British. Instead of relying upon the inherent strength of the people of India, they relied upon flattery to gain the goodwill of the British Government to achieve their objective. They talked too much about the blessings of the British rule. Aurobindo criticised the Congress creed that the only

method that could be followed in India was gradual political development. He pointed out that a similar method had not been followed in France, Ireland and many other countries. The charge of Aurobindo was that instead of organising the support of the people, the Congress under the Moderates remained a closely restricted middle-class organisation, "selfish and disingenious in its public action and hollow in its professions of a large and disinterested patriotism". He wanted the Congress to convert itself into a mass movement.

His Political Goal

Aurobindo stood for complete Swaraj for his country. India must have complete freedom from foreign domination. He did not believe in the methods of asking for minor administrative and economic reforms advocated by the Moderate leaders. He considered them utterly worthless without national freedom. He wanted free India not only for her own sake but also for the sake of humanity. He firmly believed that it is India who is destined to spearhead the next phase of human evolution. India could not rise to her full spiritual stature and show the way to the rest of the world as long as she was fettered and shackled by foreign rulers. India could not fulfil her pre-destined spiritual role as a "Guru of nations" as long as she herself was bound hand and foot and her great spirit confined and constricted. The first task before India was to become free so that she could fulfil her Swadharma and spread the spiritual message throuhgout the world. "India does not rise as other countries do for self and when she is strong, to trample on the weak. She is rising to shed the eternal light entrusted to her over the world. India has always existed for humanity and not for herself and it is for humanity and not for herself that she must be great." According to Aurobindo, complete Swaraj was a deep and fundamental spiritual necessity without which India as a nation would perish and humanity would lose for ever the spiritual light which free India could spread throughout the world.

The view of Aurobindo was that Swaraj was necessary not only for the spiritual regeneration of mankind, but it was also necessary because no real development was possible in India in the economic, social, administrative or any other field unless India was first free of her foreign rulers. There could be no progress in India without Swaraj. Aurobindo put the attainment of Swaraj above social, economic and administrative reforms. To quote him, "No national self-development is possible without the support of Rajashakti, organized political strength, commanding and wherever necessary compelling general allegiance and obedience.. Political freedom is the life-breath of a nation, to attempt social reform, educational reform, industrial expansion, the moral improvement of the race without aiming first and foremost at political freedom, is the very height of ignorance and futility."

Methods of Aurobindo

Aurobindo condemned the bankrupt policy of prayers, petitions and protests followed by the Moderate leaders. He was opposed to the policy of the Indian leaders going to England and trying to convert the British public opinion in the mistaken view that the British could be persuaded by

mere words to give up their political and economic interests in India. He dismissed "the fable that speeches of Congressmen in England can change an ignorant British public into informed and enthusiastic supporters of Indian self-government. . . . . It is only political necessity and the practical recognition that change is inevitable which can convert the statesmen of England."

Aurobindo believed that for the liberation of their country, the people of India must feel inspired to do so. Through his writings and speeches, Aurobindo tried to re-instil in the minds of the Indians a pride in the glorious and cultural heritage that their forefathers had left them, an awareness of the great heights to which India had risen in the past, of her great achievements in the realm of politics and social organisation, art and architecture, literature and learning and her unique contribution in the realm of religion and philosophy.

Aurobindo wanted to remove from the minds of the Indians the feelings of inferiority created by the British Government and its officials. He criticised the "low, imitative, un-Indian and bourgeois ideals of our national activity in the nineteenth century". He put emphasis on the cardinal fact that if India is to rise and be great as a nation, it is not by imitating the methods and institutions of English politics and commerce, but by carrying her own civilisation, purified of the weaknesses that had overtaken it, to a much higher and mightier fulfilment than any it has reached in the past. Aurobindo wanted to create in the Indian mind a proper appreciation of her own civilisation and culture and a pride in her heritage. He called upon the people of India to be brave and face sufferings cheerfully for the sake of the Motherland. He felt that centuries of foreign rule had softened the Indian spirit and created a feeling of timidity which was fatal to the success of the national movement. He assured the people that persecutions do not crush but only fortify the conviction and no power on earth can extreminate hte seed of liberty when it has once germinated in the blood of earnest and sincere men.

Aurobindo wanted the people of India to give up their lethargy and get ready for fighting the battle for India's freedom. He wanted the people of India to develop physical strength, mental strength, moral strength and above all spiritual strength.

Terrorism and Armed Revolt

For the achievement of the goal of complete freedom for India, Aurobindo advocated terrorism and armed revolt, passive resistance and boycott. As regards terrorism and armed revolt, Aurobindo believed that in certain circumstances terrorism and armed revlot may be necessary for the achievement of freedom for the country. Everything was to depend on circumstances. He was not averse to the use of force although he felt that the weapon of passive resistance was suitable for India at that time. He advocated passive resistance as a tactical manoeuvre but was not against revolutionary methods. His view was that to shirk from bloodshed and violence was a weakness deserving as severe a rebuke as Sri Krishna addressed to Arjuna when he hesitated to fight. Liberty is the life-breath of a nation. When life is attacked, any and every means of self-preservation becomes right and justifiable just as it is lawful for a man who is being strangled to rid himself

of the pressure on his throat by any means in his power. It is the nature of the pressure which determines the nature of the resistance. The answer of violence to violence is justified and inevitable. When the Mother was being ruthlessly exploited and oppressed, when her honour and glory were being ground to the dust, her children, the people of India, could not have any more scruples regarding the means to be adopted to make her free. If the people of India were the true devotees of the Mother, they must strike with the courage of a Kshatriya.

In the earlier stages of his career, Aurobindo felt that it was possible to wage successfully an armed revolt against the British Government. He admitted that India was disarmed but his view was that with proper organisation and help from outside, this difficulty could be overcome and even guerrilla warfare accompanied by general resistance and revolt might be effective. There was also the possibility of a general revolt in the Indian army. The Bhawani Mandir scheme, written and circulated by Aurobindo in 1905, presupposed the possibility of a mass armed revolt against the British. According to Aurobindo, an armed revolt was feasible if necessary organisational steps were carefully taken.

Aurobindo kept himself in touch with underground revolutionary movement in Bengal. His brother, Barindra Ghose, had established close links with the secret revolutionary groups functioning mainly in Bengal and Maharashtra and he acted as his contact man with the other revolutionaries. It is maintained that Aurobindo master-minded the secret terrorist activities in Bengal.

Aurobindo was clear regarding the use of violence in the nationalist movement. He criticised the circumstances under which the youngmen in India were forced to resort to acts of terrorism and put the blame for those activities on the British Government. On many occasions, he accused the British Government of fostering and encouraging terrorist activities by a policy of wholesale repression. If some terrorist youths were arrested and executed by the Government, Aurobindo admired their patriotism and spirit of sacrifice and blamed the criminal futility and stupidity of the policy of repression followed by the Government.

Aurobindo played a double political role. He was an outspoken leader of the Extremist Party whose creed was passive resistance. At the same time, he was the secret leader and inspirer of the underground terrorist movement whose object was to demoralise the British in India.

Passive Resistance

Aurobindo was not merely a dreamer. He was a realist. His study of the situation in the country brought him to the conclusion that an armed revolt at that stage of the history of India was not feasible. Although he continued to support and guide the underground terrorist movement to demoralise the British serving in India, he had no illusions as to the possibility of mere terrorism bringing about the freedom of his country. He wanted the national movement to be not merely an affair of secret societies and activists but a broad and open movement whcih could inspire and organise the Indian masses for the emancipation of their country. He called the method of passive resistance as "the most natural and suitable weapon" under the circumstances. He also called it "defensive resistance".

Aurobindo wrote a series of articles in 1907 which have been collectively published under the title of "The Doctrine of Passive Resistance". He made a distinction between passive and active resistance. According to him, the difference between the two is that while the method of aggressive resister is to do something by which he brings about positive harm to the Government, the method of passive resister is to abstain from doing something by which he would be helping the Government. The object in both cases is the same which is to force the hands of the Government. It is the line of attack which is different.

According to Aurobindo, the Government of India depended for the continuance of its administration mainly on the voluntary help and acquiescence of the people of India and if that help and acquiescence could systematically be withdrawn on a national scale, it would become extremely difficult for the British to continue their rule in India. If this weapon could be used skilfully and with perseverance, it was bound to strike a fatal blow to the Government in India.

According to Aurobindo, the first principle of passive reesistance is to make administration under present conditions impossible by an organised refusal to do anything which shall help either British commerce in the exploitation of the country or British officialdom in the administration of it unless and until the conditions are changed in the manner and to the extent demanded by the people. This attitude can be called boycott. To be effective, boycott had to deal with all important aspects of the functioning of the Government. The people had to be given alternative services in case of boycott. Aurobindo advocated economic boycott and Swadeshi, educational boycott and national education, judicial boycott and national arbitration courts, executive boycott and national organisation and social boycott.

Economic Boycott

The weapon of economic boycott was used by the people of Bengal in their agitation against the partition of their province. Aurobindo was also an ardent advocate of boycott. His contention was that the British were a "nation of shopkeepers" and they had in India a store-house of cheap raw materials and a growing market for British manufactured finished goods. If a determined effort was made by the freedom-loving people of India, they could voluntarily abstain from the purchase and use of British manufactured goods. If that could be done on a large scale for a sufficiently long time, that could strike a deadly blow at the British power in India. Aurobindo saw in the boycott movement a potential weapon by which it was possible to shake off British rule from India without a bloody revolution.

If the peple of India were not to use foreign goods, they must use the Swadeshi goods manufactured in their own country. That involved the ideal of economic self-sufficiency. To quote Aurobindo, "If we refuse to supply our needs from foreign sources, we must obviously supply them ourselves. We cannot have the industrial boycott without Swadeshi and the expansion of indigenous industries."

Economic boycott had two objectives. One was to shake the foundations of British rule in India and the other was to help the growth of indigenous industries in India. Aurobindo put emphasis on both the aspects. Boycott

and Swadeshi were inextricably co-related and the one without the other was bound to fail.

Educational Boycott

Aurobindo considered educational boycott as an important weapon in the struggle for India's independence. Educational boycott could directly affect students' community whose active support could be a great asset to the nationalist movement. As a matter of fact, the students of Bengal played a heroic role during the years 1905-10 in spreading the cult of boycott throughout the province in spite of the repression by the Government. The view of Aurobindo was that the existing system of education was anti-national. It was subordinate to the Government. While it discouraged patriotism, it inculcated loyalty. Hence, he wanted the people to refuse to send their children to Government schools or to schools aided and controlled by Government. If that educational boycott was general and well-organised, the educational administration of the country would be rendered impossible.

If the Indian students were to boycott the educational institutions set up by the British Government, provision had to be made for schools and colleges run by the Indians themselves and hence educational boycott was closely associated with movement of national education.

Judicial Boycott

The concept of judicial boycott was a necessary weapon in the armoury of boycott. It was consistent with the basic idea of not cooperating with any of the agencies set up by the foreign Government. To quote Aurobindo, "We are dissatisfied with the administration of justice, the ruinous costliness of the civil side, the brutal rigour of its criminal penalties and procedure, its partiality, its frequent subordination to political objects. We refuse accordingly to have any resort to the alien courts of justice, and by an organized judicial boycott propose to make the bureaucratic administration of justice impossible while these conditions continue."

As legal disputes were an important factor in social life, national arbitration courts were to be set up to try and adjudicate those disputes. To quote Aurobindo, "If we decline to enter the alien courts of justice, we must have arbitration courts of our own to settle our disputes and differences."

The movement for judicial boycott was not successful and ultimately had to be dropped. Arbitration courts could settle ordinary disputes in villages but not complicated questions of law and fact invloving huge amounts. Aurobindo himself admitted the limitations of judicial boycott.

Executive Boycott

As the executive branch of the Government came into constant touch with the people, its boycott was necessary for the success of the movement. Aurobindo knew that a handful of Englishmen were able to govern India only with the active or passive cooperation of the Indians themselves. If that link could be broken and Indian cooperation withdrawn from the British rulers, British rule in India would be weakened and ultimately collapse. Aurobindo wanted the Indians to refuse to go to the executive

for help or advice or protection or tolerate any paternal interference in their public activities.

Aurobindo pointed out that the legal system set up by the British in India was so elaborate and complicated that any executive boycott was to result in the violation of law for which there was punishment. The question was how far the boycotter was to obey that law. The view of Aurobindo was that laws made by a foreign Government did not have a binding force upon the governed. To break an unjust coercive law was not only justifiable but also a duty. To resist an unjust coercive order or interference was not only justifiable but also a duty.

Aurobindo was fully aware of the importance of non-payment of taxes, but he did not include this as one of the immediate policies of his party because he realised that it was an extreme measure which could succeed only if the people had behind them a strong national organisation. He rightly believed that "an ultimatum should never be presented unless one is prepared to follow it up to its last consequences."

Social Boycott

Social boycott was a serious matter and hence it was necessary that there should be some method by which those Indians could be punished who rejected the boycott movement and cooperated with the British Government. Social boycott was considered to be the answer. To quote Aurobindo, "The social boycott is a weapon absolutely necessary for the enforcement of the popular will in this matter."

The idea of social boycott was a simple one. The offender was to be shunned socially in parties, festivals, weddings etc. He was to be made to feel the scorn and contempt of his fellow countrymen. A great advantage of social boycott was that it did not involve any direct clash with law and also did not result in violence.

Aurobindo realised the danger of the misuse of the weapon of social boycott. Hence, his view was that social boycott should be resorted to in very serious cases.

Limits on Passive Resistance

Aurobindo wanted the movement for passive resistance to be carried on in a peaceful manner, but his peaceful approach was not unconditional. It depended upon the attitude adopted by the Government. Aurobindo had no objection to the use of force if the circumstances so demanded.

According to Aurobindo, so long as the action of the executive was peaceful and within the rules of the fight, the passive resister must maintain scrupulously his attitude of passivity. He was not bound to do so a moment beyond that. The moment the Government started coercion, passive resistance ceased and active resistance became a duty. While Aurobindo favoured passive resistance, he did not include meek submission to illegal outrage. According to him, passive resistance could not build up a strong and great nation unless it was masculine and bold in its spirit and ready at any moment to supplement itself with active resistance.

Aurobindo differed from Mahatma Gandhi in this respect. When he ad-

vocated passive resistance, he made it clear that it was not a negative and timid concept which could act as a cloak for cowardice and sluggishness but a dynamic creed which called for heroism, suffering and endurance. Aurobindo did not condemn violence, aggression or armed revolt in the manner it was done by Gandhiji. Passive resistance for Aurobindo was merely a stepping stone to active resistance, violence and armed revolt whenever necessary and possible. To quote Aurobindo, "We preach defensive resistance mainly passive in its methods at present but active whenever active resistance is needed".

Aurobindo fully realised the necessity of an effective national organisation to carry out successfully the policy of passive resistance. No movement against a foreign Government could succeed unless that was effectively organised on a national basis. In the view of Aurobindo, the Indian National Congress alone could be the organisation to carry out the programme of passive resistance. However, the Congress at that time was dominated and controlled by the Moderates who were opposed to the policy of passive resistance. Credit must be given to Aurobindo for emphasising the importance of organising an effective national movement for the success of the boycott of the Government. The Congress under Mahatma Gandhi was able to create a powerful All-India organisation which ultimately succeeded in dislodging the British power in India.

His Concept of Nation

For Aurobindo, India was not a mere geographical entity or a mere physical material land mass. It was not merely an intellectual concept. It was a Goddess incarnate. It was the mighty Mother who for centuries had nourished her children but was groaning under the yoke of the foreigners. Her pride had been shattered and her glory had gone.

In his Bhawani Mandir scheme, Aurobindo explained that a nation is not a piece of earth nor a figure of speech nor a fiction of the mind. It is mighty Shakti, composed of all Shakties of all the millions of units that make up the nation. The Shakti is the living unity of the Shakties of three hundred million people.

Aurbindo's love for India and his concept of India as a nation was far deeper than the normal patriotism that every one is expected to feel for one's country. He looked upon India as a living and pulsating spiritual entity.

In his book entitled "The Ideal of Human Unity", Aurobindo defined the nation as "a persistent psychological unit which nature has been busy developing throughout the world in various forms." Again, "Political unity is not the essential factor: it may not yet be realised and yet the nation persists and moves inevitably towards its realisation." In the West, a nation is generally understood to imply "a common political sentiment", but Aurobindo criticised the Western concept of nation and its imitation by the Moderates in India. The nation was to be organised not on the basis of a common self-interest but on the basis of a common feeling that "we are all sons of one common Mother". The Mother was invested with a personality. After his release in 1909, Aurobindo identified his concept of nation with Dharma itself. To quote him, "The Hindu nation was born with the

Sanatana Dharma. With it, it moves and with it, it grows. When the Sanatana Dharma declines, then the nation declines and if the Sanatana Dharma were capable of perishing with the nation, it would perish. Sanatana Dharma, that is nationalism." Aurobindo talked of the "birth of the Avatar in the nation" and described how the idea of the nation was immortal because "the three hundred millions of people of this country are gods in the nation, something which cannot be measured by so much land, so much money, or by so many lives. You will then realise that the idea for which you are working is something immortal and that it is an Immortal Power that is working in you." However, Aurobindo always maintained that "our ideal of patriotism proceeds on the basis of love and brotherhood and it looks beyond the unity of the nation and envisages the ultimate unity of mankind". He also discussed ways and means through which the ultimate unity of mankind could be achieved.

In one of his writings, Aurobindo explained how the ideal of the Karmayogin was to build his nation in a new form after centuries of humiliation and degradation. To quote him, "We are at the building up of a nation. We shall devote ourselves not to politics alone, nor to social questions alone, nor to theology or philosophy or literature or science by themselves, but we include these in one entity which we believe to be the national religion; to express and execute it in life is what we understand by Karmayoga. We believe that it is to make the Yoga the ideal of human life that India rises today, by the Yoga she will get the strength to preserve it. This is the spirit of the Nationalism which we profess and follow".

Aurobindo kept the concepts of nation and state separate. He never identified nation with state. He considered the nation as a spiritual subtotality but treated the state as a machine. This enabled him to conceive of the possibility of full cultural, intellectual and social growth of the nation without unnecessary interference from the Government.

His Concept of Nationalism

For Aurobindo, nationalism was not only a mission, a goal of life, but an end to be pursued as vigorously as religion. According to Haridas and Uma Mukherjee, "With him, nationalism was not a mere political slogan nor a mere intellectual idea but his first passion and religion."

According to Aurobindo, nationalism was not merely a patriotic and intellectual pastime but a deep and fervent religious Sadhana. In his Bombay speech in January 1908, Aurobindo observed: "There is a creed in India today which calls itself Nationalism, a creed which has come to you from Bengal. This is a creed which many of you have accepted when you called yourselves Nationalists. Have you realized what that means? What it is that you have taken in hand? Or is it that you have merely accepted it in the pride of a superior intellectual conviction? You call yourselves Nationalists. What is Nationalism? Nationalism is not a mere political programme. Nationalism is a religion that has come from God. Nationalism is a creed which you shall have to live. Let no man dare to call himself a Nationalist if he does so merely with a sort of intellectual pride, thinking that he is more patriotic, thinking that he is something higher, than those who do not call themselves by that name. If you are going to be a Nationalist, if you are going to assent to this religion of Nationalism, you must do it in the

vocated passive resistance, he made it clear that it was not a negative and timid concept which could act as a cloak for cowardice and sluggishness but a dynamic creed which called for heroism, suffering and endurance. Aurobindo did not condemn violence, aggression or armed revolt in the manner it was done by Gandhiji. Passive resistance for Aurobindo was merely a stepping stone to active resistance, violence and armed revolt whenever necessary and possible. To quote Aurobindo, "We preach defensive resistance mainly passive in its methods at present but active whenever active resistance is needed".

Aurobindo fully realised the necessity of an effective national organisation to carry out successfully the policy of passive resistance. No movement against a foreign Government could succeed unless that was effectively organised on a national basis. In the view of Aurobindo, the Indian National Congress alone could be the organisation to carry out the programme of passive resistance. However, the Congress at that time was dominated and controlled by the Moderates who were opposed to the policy of passive resistance. Credit must be given to Aurobindo for emphasising the importance of organising an effective national movement for the success of the boycott of the Government. The Congress under Mahatma Gandhi was able to create a powerful All-India organisation which ultimately succeeded in dislodging the British power in India.

His Concept of Nation

For Aurobindo, India was not a mere geographical entity or a mere physical material land mass. It was not merely an intellectual concept. It was a Goddess incarnate. It was the mighty Mother who for centuries had nourished her children but was groaning under the yoke of the foreigners. Her pride had been shattered and her glory had gone.

In his Bhawani Mandir scheme, Aurobindo explained that a nation is not a piece of earth nor a figure of speech nor a fiction of the mind. It is mighty Shakti, composed of all Shakties of all the millions of units that make up the nation. The Shakti is the living unity of the Shakties of three hundred million people.

Aurbindo's love for India and his concept of India as a nation was far deeper than the normal patriotism that every one is expected to feel for one's country. He looked upon India as a living and pulsating spiritual entity.

In his book entitled "The Ideal of Human Unity", Aurobindo defined the nation as "a persistent psychological unit which nature has been busy developing throughout the world in various forms." Again, "Political unity is not the essential factor: it may not yet be realised and yet the nation persists and moves inevitably towards its realisation." In the West, a nation is generally understood to imply "a common political sentiment", but Aurobindo criticised the Western concept of nation and its imitation by the Moderates in India. The nation was to be organised not on the basis of a common self-interest but on the basis of a common feeling that "we are all sons of one common Mother". The Mother was invested with a personality. After his release in 1909, Aurobindo identified his concept of nation with Dharma itself. To quote him, "The Hindu nation was born with the

Sanatana Dharma. With it, it moves and with it, it grows. When the Sanatana Dharma declines, then the nation declines and if the Sanatana Dharma were capable of perishing with the nation, it would perish. Sanatana Dharma, that is nationalism." Aurobindo talked of the "birth of the Avatar in the nation" and described how the idea of the nation was immortal because "the three hundred millions of people of this country are gods in the nation, something which cannot be measured by so much land, so much money, or by so many lives. You will then realise that the idea for which you are working is something immortal and that it is an Immortal Power that is working in you." However, Aurobindo always maintained that "our ideal of patriotism proceeds on the basis of love and brotherhood and it looks beyond the unity of the nation and envisages the ultimate unity of mankind". He also discussed ways and means through which the ultimate unity of mankind could be achieved.

In one of his writings, Aurobindo explained how the ideal of the Karmayogin was to build his nation in a new form after centuries of humiliation and degradation. To quote him, "We are at the building up of a nation. We shall devote ourselves not to politics alone, nor to social questions alone, nor to theology or philosophy or literature or science by themselves, but we include these in one entity which we believe to be the national religion; to express and execute it in life is what we understand by Karmayoga. We believe that it is to make the Yoga the ideal of human life that India rises today, by the Yoga she will get the strength to preserve it. This is the spirit of the Nationalism which we profess and follow".

Aurobindo kept the concepts of nation and state separate. He never identified nation with state. He considered the nation as a spiritual subtotality but treated the state as a machine. This enabled him to conceive of the possibility of full cultural, intellectual and social growth of the nation without unnecessary interference from the Government.

His Concept of Nationalism

For Aurobindo, nationalism was not only a mission, a goal of life, but an end to be pursued as vigorously as religion. According to Haridas and Uma Mukherjee, "With him, nationalism was not a mere political slogan nor a mere intellectual idea but his first passion and religion."

According to Aurobindo, nationalism was not merely a patriotic and intellectual pastime but a deep and fervent religious Sadhana. In his Bombay speech in January 1908, Aurobindo observed: "There is a creed in India today which calls itself Nationalism, a creed which has come to you from Bengal. This is a creed which many of you have accepted when you called yourselves Nationalists. Have you realized what that means? What it is that you have taken in hand? Or is it that you have merely accepted it in the pride of a superior intellectual conviction? You call yourselves Nationalists. What is Nationalism? Nationalism is not a mere political programme. Nationalism is a religion that has come from God. Nationalism is a creed which you shall have to live. Let no man dare to call himself a Nationalist if he does so merely with a sort of intellectual pride, thinking that he is more patriotic, thinking that he is something higher, than those who do not call themselves by that name. If you are going to be a Nationalist, if you are going to assent to this religion of Nationalism, you must do it in the

religious spirit. You must remember that you are the instruments of God.. This is happening daily in Bengal, because, in Bengal, Nationalism has come to the people as a religion, and it has been accepted as a religion.. It always happens when a new religion is preached when God is going to be born in the people, that.... forces rise with all their weapons in their hands to crush the religion. In Bengal too a new religion, a religion divine and Sattvic has been preached and this religion they (the British rulers) are trying with all the weapons at their command to crush. By what strength are we in Bengal able to survive? Nationalism is not going to be crushed. Nationalism survives in the strength of God and it is not possible to crush it, whatever weapons are brought against it. Nationalism is immortal. Nationalism cannot die; because it is no human thing, it is God who is working in Bengal. God cannot be killed, God cannot be sent to jail."

According to Aurobindo, nationalism was a much deeper and more profound conncept than mere patriotism. He looked upon nationalism as a religious practice essential for the emancipation of the Motherland and the spiritual development of the people. He did not allow his nationalism to degenerate into mere chauvinism or narrow revivalism. He looked upon India's emancipation as a necessary thing so that India could fulfil her destiny as the spiritual guide of humanity at large. His nationalism developed into internationalism.

Aurobindo not only awakened his countrymen to their sacred duty to their country, but also imparted a new moral tone to the national movement, ultimately preparing the mind of the country for the revolution which was ahead. He praised the nation as the Mother, but a Mother in chains and it was the primary duty of her sons to win freedom for the Mother in every possible way.

The view of Aurobindo was that the demand for Swaraj was a natural corollary of the ideal of nationalism. He believed that every nation on earth had a peculiar bent of its own, its individuality which could not be maintained under the domination of a foreign power representing a different temperament and a different genius. The temper of the Anglo-Saxon culture was an antithesis of that of Indian culture. The Anglo-Saxon people gave the greatest importance to the immediate, practical and material gains while India's chief characteristic was her spiritualism. His view was that if India continued to remain a province of the British Empire, sharing its institutions and goverend by its policy, her fate would be no better than that of ancient Greece under Roman domination. The view of Aurobindo was that a foreign rule, however benevolent, could never willingly foster the centres of strength in the life of the subject nation in whose relation it always stands not as a parasite but as a octopus. It is only by throwing off the foreign octopus from its body-politic that a subject people could ever hope to grow as a separate entity and realise its destiny."

Aurobindo was convinced that imitation of Europe was not conducive to the regeneration of India. The test of the vitality of the nationalist movement was its non-importive, non-imitative and non-artificial character. To quote him, "For a nation which is in attempting to imprint its personality on such a movement is moving towards self-sterilization and death". He called upon the people of India to uphold the Sanatana Dharma which was the essence of their national personality.

The concept of nationalism as a religion opened wider horizons for the nationalist movement. Aurobindo felt that the task before the Indians was not mechanical but moral, not political but spiritual. The aim of the nationalist movement was not confined to an alteration of the form of Government from a colonial rule to self-Government. It embraced a comprehensive programme of nation-building. Politics was a part of that programme but only a part. The realisation of the spirituality of India alone could make the nation free and great. The formula of European politics was insufficient. He insisted that India's salvation did not lie in the enlargement of Legislative Councils, introduction of the elective principle, colonial self-Government etc. His ideal of nationalism could not accommodate the objective of dominion status for India as demanded by the Moderates. Aurobindo aimed at seizure of political power as a prelude to India's national regeneration. Once freedom from foreign yoke was achieved, all other steps in the direction of national regeneration would be undertaken successfully. Aurobindo's concept of Swaraj was something more than mere political freedom. To quote him, "Swaraj as a sort of European ideal, political liberty for the sake of political self-assertion, will not awaken India. Swaraj as the fulfilment of the ancient life of India under modern conditions, the return of the Satyayuga of national greatness, the resumption by her of great role of teacher and guide, self-liberation of the people for the final fulfilment of the Vedantic ideal in politics, this is the true Swaraj for India. She cannot do it without taking the management of her own life into her own hands. She must live her own life and not the life of a part or subordinate in a foreign empire."

According to Aurobindo, nationalism in India had two objects in view. One was to win Swaraj for India so as to clean her social and political life from the pollution of European origin. The second was to return to "our old national individuality" so that India could play her role in the redemption of the whole world.

The regeneration of India was not the final goal of Aurobindo. It was a stepping stone to universal regeneration. Aurobindo wrote thus in 1908: "A great light is dawning on the East, a light whose first heralding glimpses are already seen on the horizon. The perfect expression of Hindu spirituality was the signal for the resurgence of the East. Mankind has long been experimenting with various kinds of thought, different principles of ethics, strange dreams of perfection to be gained by material means, impossible millenniums and humanitarian hopes. Nowhere has society or politics helped it to escape from the necessity of sorrow, poverty, strife, dissatisfaction from which it strives for an outlet: for whoever is trying to find one by material means, must inevitably fail. The East alone has some knowledge of truth, the East alone can teach the West, the East alone can save mankind."

The view of Dr. V. P. Varma is that his championship of the cultural and religious revival of India and his passionate advocacy of Sanatana Dharma as nationalism was never a reactionary attempt. He was not reviving the dogmatic theology of the scriptures but the moral and spiritual idealism of the ancient sacred books. His call was for the harnessing of moral forces. By emphasising the inward source of national strength, Aurobindo provided a great gospel for the resurgence of India. He reconciled his

nationalism with ultimate human unity. His nationalism was not a limited and partial creed. He did not believe in the complete consecration and total self-dedication of the individual to the nation. His nationalism was a stage in the social and political evolution of man. His gospel and plan for human unity and a religion of humanity represent his great contributions to world politics and civilization.

Dr. Varma further points out that Aurobindo over-emphasized the concept of revivalism. If revivalism could create the spirit of moral idealism, it could also lead to a reactionary longing for the past and an apathy towards the present and the future. There was a strong belief in some sections of the educated classes in India that the key to political progress and social organisation lay in the ancient classics of India and that created an anti-scientific attitude. Moreover, it was doubtful if the Indian classics contained the climax of philosophic wisdom. Revivalism can also create an attitude of racial pride and superiority which is a danger to peace (The Political Philosophy of Sri Aurobnido, pp. 266-8).

Critics point out that Radicals like Aurobindo appealed to Hindu chauvinism to gain popularity and thereby widened the rift between the Hindus and Muslims which ultimately resulted in the partition of India. Dr. Karan Singh does not accept this view. According to him, the key role of Radicals like Aurobindo was to transform the national movement from a narrow intellectual pastime of the English-educated intelligentsia into a broad mass movement. That transformation could not have been achieved unless the masses of whom the majority were the Hindus, were galvanized and awakened from their stupor. That was impossible unless they were touched at very deepest level which could not have been any other than the religious level. Most of the radical leaders were Hindus of deep religious and spiritual convictions and their appeal to the masses could not have been couched in non-religious terms. The philosophy of the Radicals appealed primarily to the Hindus but they neither under-rated nor attacked any other great religion of India. Dr. Karan Singh further points out that Aurobindo attached great importance to winning over the support of the Muslims to the cause of nationalism in India. Hence, he cannot be accused of being a Hindu revivalist. (Prophet of Indian Nationalism, pp. 77-8).

Ideal of Human Unity

The ideal of human unity in the thought of Aurobindo emanates from his intense spiritualism or idealism. He viewed the entire universe as a manifestation of the Spirit or the Idea. In one of his speeches, he declared, "According to our philosophy, it is the idea which expresses itself in matter. This is true also in the life of humanity: it is true in politics, in the progress and life of a nation. It is the idea which shapes material institutions."

The material world owes its origin to the Divine Being. It proceeds in an evolutionary direction for ultimate realisation of the Idea. There were to be three stages in the process of spiritual evolution. In the first stage, a part of the Supreme, Unconditioned and Absolute Reality plunged into the grossest and densest matter and the material world was created. That was followed by the appearance of life in primitive forms and subsequently mind first appeared among the living creatures. The intermediate stage was marked by the advent of human race when intellect began to assume the

dominant role. The present age was identified with this stage when mankind was poised for next leap forward in the evolutionary process. The final step in that direction would be characterised by the evolution of Mind to Supermind when this creation will revert to the source of its origin.

Aurobindo gave an elaborate procedure of Yoga whereby a man could actively contribute towards the hastening of the evolutionary process. Yoga was not designed to secure emancipation of the individual alone. It was meant to equip the individual to serve the entire mankind. Dr. Karan Singh writes, "Sri Aurobindo is emphatic that his Yoga is not merely directed towards individual salvation but is for humanity as a whole. Whereas traditional religions offered the devotee individual liberation from the bondage of material existence and arise into the luminous spiritual sphere, Sri Aurobindo insisted that the ascent was only one aspect of the whole spiritual adventure. Having ascended, the Yogi must again come down so that he can help the mass of humanity and indeed all matter in whatsoever form, to rise. He sought not mere individual liberation, not liberation for the entire human race, not even liberation for all living beings, but nothing less than a complete transformation of material consciousness itself, the creation of "a new heaven and new earth".

The theory of divine origin of human mind is linked up with his concept of human unity. Love and freedom are the real variables of the culture of man which transcends all forms of civilisation developed by man. Although mankind is subdivided into a large number of territorial units, with their varying life-styles, yet the culture underlying the different civilisations is essentially one and the same everywhere. Self-realisation directs man to transcend the bounds of civilisation and transform himself in accordance with the culture of man. As man can attain self-realisation only within a social setting provided by his nation, national self-realisation is an indispensable stage in the process of self-realisation by humanity. Each nation defines culture according to its own genius and contributes to the progress of mankind in its own way. National self-realisation involves man's identification with his nation. This, in turn, leads to supranational stage which corresponds to supramental stage in the all-pervading process of human evolution.

Aurobindo was convinced that Indian civilisation was superior to Western civilisation as the former was better equipped to lead humanity to its ultimate goal .He pointed out that Indian civilisation was informed by spirituality while the Western civilisation was based on materialism emanating from the cult of rationalism. The excellence of India in the religious field made her the guardian, exampler and missionary of universal welfare, while the insistence of the West on rationalism promoted individualism, treating each individual as a self-driven system and accepting competitive selfishness as the basis of human relations. The Indian civilisation considered the nation as an organism but the Western civilisation considered it as a mechanism. The Indian concept of nation as an organism drew every individual into its fold directing him to observe the true law and norm of his nature and the nature of his kind. Although all nations of the world had a right to exist independently and evolve their civilisations according to their own genius, yet only such a nation was qualified to assume their leadership which

could show them the way to the spiritual evolution of humanity. Aurobindo was convinced that India was capable of assuming that responsibility.

The doctrine of human unity as propounded by Aurobindo does not envisage the merger of all nations into one. It seeks different nations of the world contributing to the progress of mankind from a materialistic to a spiritualised society. That is why Aurobindo insisted on India playing the role of the guide and torch-bearer of universal human progress.

The view of Aurobindo was that the law of evolution did not demand casting of the entire humanity into a single uniform mould. The division of humanity into various nations reflected multi-faceted genius of the Divine Being. If each nation tried to attain excellence according to its own genius, that would eventually lead to the emergence of human unity reflecting manifold virtues of the Divine Being. A nationalist society divided into co-existing independent nations making their own contribution to the spiritual evolution of mankind each according to its own genius, is the immediate goal of the reorganisation of mankind. As the nationalist society will be striving for spiritual excellence, it will take the form of a spiritualised society. It will be a society in which the national units of today will be converted into the units of a world society. While they will continue to function as units of culture, they would learn to look beyond their physical boundaries and serve as stepping stones for the realisation of the vision of the unity of mankind.

In his vision of spiritualised society, Aurobindo contemplated autonomous national units, each pledged to uphold the culture of man in its own way. They would not be sovereign but tied together in a constitutional form of "a federation of nationalities". Each nation was to find its due place under the scheme of human unity. Each civilisation was to be respected as a peculiar manifestation of the culture of man. From that scheme of human unity was to emerge the final unity wherein one uniform civilisation was to represent the culture of man.

The State

Aurobindo does not give us a systematic theory of the state. However, he has made certain significant observations on the state. According to him, "The state is the masterful but arbitrary and intolerant science and reason of man that successfully takes the place of the institutions and evolutionary experimentations of nature; intelligent organisation replaces natural organism." The history of the state represents an advancing process of political unification through the development of a central focus of organised power. Before the emergence of the state, man was dominated by ethnic sentiments of kinship. The state is based on teritorial centralisation. It is synchronistic with the centralisation of political power. In the early history of mankind, there is diversity and plurality of centres of political power. The growth of monarchy played an important part in that process.

Aurobindo did not attribute any ethical or moral character to the state. He thought of the state only in mechnical terms. According to him, the state had no soul. It was a military, political and economic force. Theoretically, the state claimed to represent and crystallize the best available political wisdom in the country, but in actual practice the phenomena and dynamics of the state were marked by lustful struggles, sectional and group

hatreds and jealousies and the absence of any harmonising ethical principle. The state did not represent the best minds and best idealism of a nation. Often, the state was "a collective egoism much inferior to the best of which the community is capable." The actual working of the states showed an expansionst tendency leading to imperialism and brutal mass murders in big wars.

The view of Aurobindo was that the attempt of the state to grow into an intellectual and moral being was an interesting phenomenon of the modern world. However, the claim of the state to absorb all free individual activities was premature and if satisfied, would surely end in a check to human progress. According to Aurobindo, "The state is a convenient and a rather clumsy convenience for our common development; it ought never to be made an end in itself." It is the energy of the individual which is really the effective agent of collective progress. "The state sometimes comes in to aid if and when; if its aid does not mean undue control, it serves a positively useful end."

According to Aurobindo, "Man lives by the community; he needs it to develop himself individually as well as collectively." He asked the question, "Is it true that a state governed action is the most capable of developing the individual perfectly as well as of serving the common ends of the community?" His reply is: "It is not true. What is true is that it is capable of providing the cooperative action of the individuals in the community with all necessary obstacles which would otherwise interfere with its working. Here the real utility of the state ceases".

Aurobindo rejects state collectivism. He also disapproves of the philosophy of orthodox English individualism of the nineteenth century. According to him, the business of the state is to provide all possible facilities for cooperative action, to remove obstacles to prevent all really harmful waste and friction and remove avoidable injustice to secure for every individual a just and equal chance of self-development and satisfaction to the extent of his powers and in the line of his nature. All unnecessary interference with the freedom of man's growth is harmful. Even cooperative action is injurious, if in spite of seeking the good of all, it stimulates the individual to a common egoism and prevents so much freedom and initiative as is necessary for the flowering of a more perfectly developed humanity.

Aurobindo did not believe in the organic theory of the state, but he used the organic analogy with reference to society. He was not an economic individualist. He wanted the state to secure for all "a just and equal chance of self-development and satisfaction to the extent of his powers and in the line of his nature". He accepted the egalitarian economic philosophy of socialism but he did not say that the goal of individual life and the state was the same. He was critical of the so-called welfare state.

According to Aurobindo, the state was not qualified to demand self-sacrifice from the individuals. The state is merely a convenience for our common development. It cannot be made an end in itself.

According to Aurobindo, "The state is not an organism; it is a machinery and it works like a machine, without tact, taste, delicacy or intuition. It tries to manufacture, but what humanity is here to do is to grow and create". A healthy unity of mankind cannot be brought about by State

machinery. In order to achieve a real unity of mankind, it is necessary to subordinate the mechanical means to our true development "through a moralised and even spiritualised humanity united in its inner soul and not only in its outward life and body".

Freedom

In one sense, the whole career of Aurobindo was a fight for freedom. During the period from 1905 to 1910, he fought for the freedom of his country from the foreign Government. He was one of the important leaders of the Extremist Party which he preferred to call the Nationalist party. He fought for both political and economic freedom—Swaraj and Swadeshi. During the rest of his life at Pondicherry from 1910 to 1950, he fought on a spiritual plane. That was a fight for spiritual freedom.

By freedom, Aurobindo meant the "freedom to obey the law of our being; to grow to our natural self-fulfilment, to find out naturally and freely our harmony with the environment". He was prepared to accept the external restraints enforced by law. However, he maintained that "All repressive or preventive law is only a make-shift, a substitute for the true law which must develop from within and be not a check on liberty but its outward image and visible expression. Human society progresses really and vitally in proportion as law becomes the child of freedom; it will reach its perfection when man having learned to know and become spiritually one with his fellowmen, the spontaneous law of his society exists only as the outward world of his self-governed inner liberty."

For Aurobindo, inner liberty was more vital and real than outer liberty. Particularly after his retirement from active politics, he talked in terms of inner liberty and spiritual freedom.

Aurobindo pointed out that the Westerners had found out the way to external freedom as the Indians had found out the way to internal freedom. He himself put more emphasis on inner freedom than on outer freedom because "the first thing that a nation must do is to realise the true freedom that is within us and it is only when you understand that freedom from within is freedom from without, you will be really free."

Aurobindo realised that in the existing circumstances unqualified Swaraj or inner freedom might not be completely achieved. Hence, he suggested the possibility of a co-relationship between inner freedom and outer freedom. A pursuit for inner freedom would be incomplete without an attempt at outer freedom as the latter would be useless unless it led to the former.

According to Aurobnido, the hidden power of the human soul had to be discovered for the real integration of freedom and equality. Only then can a spiritual society be built which will show equal consideration to the claims and demands of the individual and the group.

In Aurobindo's system of thought, freedom of the individual is not meant to secure exclusively his own emancipation. It is valuable because of its contribution to national development. The denial of freedom to an individual is a loss to the nation. Likewise, denial of freedom to a nation is a loss to humanity. Aurobindo wrote thus in 1907: "Individual liberty is necessary to national development because if the individual is unduly ham-

pered, the richness of national life suffers and is impoverished. If the individual is given free room to realise himself, to perfect, specialise and enrich his particular powers and attain the full height of his manhood, the variety and rapidity of national progress is immensely increased. In so far as he is fettered and denied scope, the development of the nation is cramped and retarded".

Aurobindo stood not only for individual freedom but also for freedom for different classes in society. To quote him, "Just as individual liberty is necessary for the richness and variety of national development, so self-Government is necessary for its completeness and the full deployment of national strength. If certain classes are dominant and others depressed, the result is that the potential strength of the depressed classes which is so much valuable force, is lost to the sum of national strength."

Aurobindo maintained that social freedom was a necessary condition of individual freedom. Social freedom also depended upon political freedom. Aurobindo wrote thus in 1908, "Without political freedom, the soul of man is crippled. Only a few mighty spirits can rise above their surroundings but the ordinary man is a slave of his surroundings and if those be mean, servile and degraded, he himself will be mean, servile and degraded, Social freedom can only be born where soul of man is large, free and generous, not enslaved to petty aims and thoughts. If freedom is absent, the community has no great end to follow and the individual is confined in a narrow circuit in which the superiority of caste, wealth or class is the only ambition which he can cherish. If political freedom opens to him a wider horizon, he forgets the lesser ambitions."

According to Aurobindo, moral freedom was incomplete without political freedom. Hence, he advocated the attainment of Swaraj as the goal of the nationalist movement. Each nation must be free so that it could play its destined role in the world. He demanded Swaraj for India not only for the people of India but also for the people of the world. He maintained that Indian struggle for freedom was a tribute to the spiritual evolution of Humarity itself as independent India was to play the role of torch-bearer of Dharma in the march of humanity towards its ultimate goal.

Individual

According to Aurobindo, the individual is not merely a social unity, His existence, his right and claim to live and grow are not founded solely on his social work. He is something in himself, a soul, a being, who has to fulfil his own individual truth and law as well as his natural or assigned part in the truth and law of collective eixstence. The individual demands freedom, space and initiative for his soul and for his nature.

The view of Aurobindo is that it is not correct to say that the state is something greater than the individuals constituting it and can with impunity arrogate this oppressive supremacy.

Aurobindo put forward the ideal of spiritual individualism in which truth is superior to any social or political obligation. To quote him, "The individual does not owe his ultimate allegiance either to the state which is a machine or to the community which is a part of life and not the whole of life: his allegiance must be to the Truth, the self, the spirit, the Divine

which is in him and in all; not to subordinate, or lose himself in the mass, but to find and express that truth of being in himself and help the community and humanity in its seeking for its own truth and fullness of being must be the real object of existence."

Law

Aurobindo accepted the idea of harmony between the individual and the state for his ideal society. However, in the imperfect world, he would like to fight for the legitimate rights of the individual against the state. That explains why during the Anti-Partition agitation, he advocated passive resistance against the unjust laws and decrees and ordinances of the Government.

According to Aurobindo, there are two bases for the authority of law. The first basis is the "strong interest of the majority or of a dominant minority or the community as a whole in maintaining it." The second basis is the monopolistic possession of the instruments of coercion by the law-enforcing agency. To quote him, "The metaphorical sword of justice can only act because there is a real sword behind it to enforce its decrees and penalties against the rebel and the dissident." If law is to be obeyed by enlightened citizens, it has to be based on a generalised rational approach. If obedience to law demands on the whole subservience to local and sectional interests, it invites rebellion and resistance.

Aurobindo referred to three stages in the evolution of law. The first stage was one of un-written or partly written system, e.g., decretals, precedents etc. The law at that stage controlled almost the whole sphere of life and there was no distinction between social, religious and political law. The second stage was represented by systematic institutes. The third stage was that of codes. In that stage, a sovereign authority established the law code.

Aurobindo pleaded for the use of law to safeguard liberty. Law was to be used to preserve liberty and not to suppress it. To quote him, "Human society progresses really and vitally in proportion as law becomes the child of freedom, it will reach perfection when man learns to know and becomes spiritually one with his fellowmen, the spontaneous law of his society exists only as outward mould of his self-governed liberty." Again, "Better anarchy than the long continuance of a law which is not our own or which our real nature cannot assimilate. And all repressive or preventive law is only a make-shift, a substitute for the true law which must develop from within and be not a check on liberty, but its outward image and visible expression."

According to Aurobindo, the basis of social and political regulation in spiriutalised society should be the inner light and insight of the human soul. To quote him, "The works of life right themselves, escape from confusion, substitute for the artificial or legal order imposed by the intellect and for the arbitrary rule of desire the guidance of the soul's insight, enter into the profound paths of the spirit."

Aurobindo also wrote : "A law imposed by a people on itself has a binding force which cannot be ignored except under extreme necessity; a law imposed from outside has no such moral sanction; its claim to obedience must rest on coercive force or on its own equitable and beneficial character and not on the source from which it proceeds. If it is unjust and oppressive, it

may become a duty to disobey it and quietly endure the punishment which the law has provided for its violation".

Democracy

According to Aurobindo, there were two fundamental principles of individualistic democracy. All individuals were to have equal political say because otherwise there would be the dominance of a socially and economically powerful segment in society. It was morally sound that as long as an individual did not encroach upon the rights of others, he should be allowed "to govern his life according to the dictates of his own reason." The advocates of democracy believed that mass education and political freedom could solve most of the problems confronting man. Democracy had added to the stature of the common man. For the first time in history, the people were "erect, active and alive, and where there is life, there is always a hope for better things." The people were asked to exercise their political choice in the democratic countries and that was a great ethical gain. In spite of restricted opportunities for education and limitations on the active exercise of political intelligence, "there is a much greater equalization (of educational and other opportunities) than was at all possible in former states of society."

Aurobindo made a distinction between the mentality and political orientations of the aristocratic and monarchical states from democracies "which are bourgeois states in the form either of constitutional monarchy or a middle-class republic." The former were political in their set up and were basically interested in territorial and political gains and not so much in commercial advantages. The bourgeois democratic states were interested principally in the commercial field and wanted colonies for the supply of raw materials and for providing markets for their manufactured goods. They were chiefly interested in more and more of wealth. They extended the techniques of calculation and bargaining also to the political and diplomatic field. They resorted to war as the last expedient and not a first expedient. They would prefer demonstration of force to actual resort to force. Due to the growth of industrial technology, the bourgeois democratic states had built up a colossal war machine which was not to be matched before. The view of Aurobindo was that the democratic political form was a contribution of Western civilisation, but he also recognised the fact that in the East, there were some "purely social democracies."

Aurobindo pointed out four consequences of the individualistic democratic ideal in practice. (1) Although the concept of equality had been loudly preached, in actual practice a dominant class obtained social and political leadership in the name of democracy. (2) Another consequence was an increasing effort on the part of the exploited and the under-privileged to assert their rights. There was the possibility of a "war of classes" if the exploited sections persisted in their demand to have real democracy. (3) There was a perpetual strife of parties. Although the struggle was simple at the beginning, later on it developed into "an important and sterilising chaos of names, labels, programmes, war-cries." (4) There was a growing "stress of competition which replaces the ordered tyrannies of the infra-rational periods of humanity by a sort of ordered conflict. And this conflict ends in the survival not of the spiritually, rationally or physically fittest, but of the most fortunate and vitally successful. The unending conflict of com-

peting groups and interests leads to the absorption of human energies in socially unproductive tasks and enterprises, and hence the perfect equality of educational and other opportunities which democracy loudly professes to foster, does not become a reality.

Aurobindo criticized democracy on various grounds. (1) The "mass consciousness by itself moves by a vague, half-formed or unformed subliminal and commonly sub-conscient impulse rising to the surface; it is prone to a blind or half-seeing unanimity which suppresses the individual in the common movement; if it thinks, it is by the motto, the slogan, the watchword, the common crude or formed idea, the traditional, the accepted customary notion; it acts, when not by instinct or on impulse, then by the rule of the pack, the herd mentality, the type law." Aurobindo did not want that the mass mind should be entrusted with the function of the Government which required emotional discipline and a rational detachment. He was opposed to the governance of the democratic cultus of the average man.

(2) Another criticism of democracy was that virtually it amounted not to the Government of the people, by the people and for the people, but to the rule of the bourgeoisie and the ascendancy of the plutocratic sections. According to Aurobindo, perfect and real democracy did not exist anywhere in the world. "Everywhere, the propertied and professional classes and the bourgeoisie (have) governed in the name of the people." Instead of a harmonious, ordered and rationalised society, "there has been organised a huge competitive system, a frantically rapid and one-sided development of industrialism and under the garb of democracy an increasing plutocratic tendency that shocks by its ostentatious grossness and the magnitude of its gulfs and distances."

(3) Whatever the external form of democracy, real governance was by a small group. Aurobindo wrote, "The society has no discoverable common reason and will belonging alike to all its members; for the group-soul rather works out its tendencies by a diversity of opinion, a diversity of wills, a diversity of life, and the vitality of the group-life depends largely upon the working of this diversity, its continuity, its richness. Since that is so, Government by the organised state must mean always Government by a number of individuals—whether that number be in theory the minority or the majority makes in the end little fundamental difference. For even when it is the majority that nominally governs, it is in fact always the reason and will of a comparatively few effective men—and not really any common reason and will of all—that rules and regulates things with the consent of the half-hypnotised mass."

(4) Aurobindo was also critical of the mechanism of modern representative democracy. To quote him, "In large states, the personal share of each citizen in the Government cannot be effective; he can only have an equal share—illusory for the individual although effective in the mass—in the periodical choice of his legislators and administrators. Even if these have not practically to be elected from a class which is not the whole and even the majority of the community, at present almost everywhere the middle-class; still these legislators and administrators do not really represent their electors. The power they represent is another, a formless and bodyless entity, which has taken the place of monarch and aristocracy, that impersonal group being which assumes some sort of outward form and body and

conscious action in the huge mechanism of the modern state. Against this power the individual is much more helpless than he was against old oppressions." The role of the individual became insignificant.

Capitalism

Aurobindo was a great critic of capitalism and he was opposed to the development of capitalist concentrations and monopolistic combines. He considered the growth of trusts and syndicates as "the most dangerous development of capitalism." They increased the power and strength of the capitalists for exploitation. According to Aurobindo, "So long as we follow the European spirit and European model, the individual competitive selfishness, the bond of mere interest in the joint stock company or that worst and most dangerous development of cooperative capitalism, the giant octopus-like trust and syndicate, we shall never succeed in rebuilding a healthy industrial life."

After the World War I, Aurobindo prophesised the collapse of capitalism. His view was that capitalism had lost its moral force as it supported a system which resulted in the exploitation and ruin of the workers. Capitalism had also failed to solve the material problems which demanded immediate solution. To quote him, "The existing European system of civilisation at least in its figure of capitalistic industrialism has reached its own monstrous limits, broken itself by its own mass and is condemned to perish."

Although Aurobindo was a critic of capitalism, he did not advocate the use of violence for its overthrow.

Socialism

Aurobindo was attracted by the social and economic egalitarianism of socialism but he did not approve of its authoritarianism. There could be no liberty under organised socialism. The full development of socialism would result in the obliteration of the distinction between social and political activities although the distinction was a vital one.

Under socialism, even social activities can be interfered with by the Government. That adds to the administrative activities of the state. Socialism represents the omnipotence of the state. Totalitarianism was the natural and almost inevitable destiny of socialism. To quote Aurobindo, "Nothing great or small escapes its purview. Birth and marriage, labour and amusement and rest, education, culture, training of physique and character, the socialist state leaves nothing outside its scope and its busy intolerant control."

Aurobindo criticised the hesitating, vacillating character of social democracy which at times led to the rise of totalitarianism and dictatorship in several countries. Aurobindo feared that at some future time, socialism might become even imperialistic. Perhaps, a strong socialist state may try to foster a socialist revolution in the neighbouring country. There were also chances that if socialism succeeded in the relatively advanced countries of Europe and the United States, it may develop racial prejudice and may not be willing to concede equality to the weaker nations.

Aurobindo did not believe that Communism was committed to the destruction of the existing world civilisation. According to him, Communism

was not destructive of individual autonomy and the principles advocated by individualism.

Aurobindo maintained that state omnipotence and social brotherhood could not work together. He stood for a deeper sentiment of fraternity as the real social bond. There was the necessity of a feeling of common spiritual fraternity. The view of Aurobindo was that the socialists were mistaken in trying to build a regime of equality in the absence of spiritual fraternity. The final solution of the problem of man lies in the advent of a spiritualised society.

Criticism of Bentham

Aurobindo was opposed to the utilitarianism of Bentham as an ethical and political norm. He criticised Benthanism from the standpoint of idealistic ethics. He condemned "its shallow portentous errors, its substitution of a practical, outward and occasional test for the inner, subjective and absolute motive of ethics, its reduction of ethical action to an impossibly scientific and quite impracticable jugglery of moral mathematics, attractive enough to the reasoning and logical mind, quite false and alien to the whole instinct and institution of the ethical being."

According to Aurobindo, ethics is not merely a social science and discipline but a way for subjective purification on the path to the realisation of the Divine. Ultimately, individual good and social good had both to be secured.

Whether Revivalist

Aurobindo was a revivalist in the sense that he wanted to revive "the spirit, ideals and methods of ancient India". He was against blind imitation of the West. To quote him, "It is God's will that we should be ourselves and not Europe". However, this does not mean that Aurobindo wanted to keep himself immune from the influence of the West. To quote him, "What we have to take from the West, we shall take as Indians." The view of Romain Rolland was that he recognised in Aurobindo "the completest synthesis that has been realised to this day of the genius of Asia and genius of Europe".

Estimate

Dr. Karan Singh discusses the contribution of Aurobindo to modern Indian political thought under four heads viz., his concept of spiritual nationalism and the divinity of the Motherland, his exposition of the ideal of complete freedom from foreign rule, his contribution to the theory of boycott and passive resistance and his vision of the high role that India was destined to play in world affairs and his ideal of human unity.

The bedrock of the political philosophy of Aurobindo was his concept of spiritual nationalism and the divinity of the Motherland. His exposition of the religion of nationalism and the necessity for complete sacrifice at the feet of Mother India was unsurpassed. He defined the essence of spiritual nationalism in a manner which could not be equalled. He gave to the national movement in India a new dimension and placed before it an inspired

and inspiring spiritual ideal. His Bhawani Mandir scheme became the gospel of the Indian revolutionaries. Thousands of patriots sacrificed their lives with a smile and cry of Bande Mataram on their lips.

Another contribution of Aurobindo was his ideal of complete freedom from foreign rule and his role of radicalizing the national movement. He infused a new spirit into the national movement in India and changed the very complexion of the politics in the country. He gave a radical philosophy to politics. He placed before the people the high ideal of Poorna Swaraj or complete independence. He had the courage to demand freedom openly, not as a favour from a foreign Government but as the inalienable birth-right of the people of India. His concept of divinity of the Motherland led to the demand for her complete emancipation from the foreign rule. He emphasized the necessity of generating mass enthusiasm and participation in the national cause. He tried to democratise the national movement. He was one of the earliest true democrats on the modern Indian scene. He emphasized the fact that the people of India must suffer to get freedom which was not to be got as charity from the foreign Government. He believed in the necessity for "purification by blood and fire" before India could achieve freedom. He was not opposed to social reform and also recognised its due importance but he wanted the people of India to concentrate all their attention on achieving independence and then attend to the problem of social reform. To attempt social reform before becoming independent was like putting the cart before the horse.

Aurobindo made a great contribution to the theory of boycott and passive resistance. He was not only a theorist but a masterly tactician. He made concrete suggestions about the positive steps to be taken for the liberation of the country. Along with his theory of economic boycott, he stressed the necessity of Swadeshi. Alongwith educational boycott, he put forward his views on national education. Alongwith judicial boycott, he emphasized the necessity of setting up national arbitration courts. Alongwith executive boycott, he expounded the importance of national organisation. To make boycott effective, he emphasized the necessity of social boycott.

It is not correct to say that Aurobindo was an anarchist because he sought to replace British rule not by anarchy but by national rule. As regards terrorism, he was closely in touch with secret revolutionary groups throughout the country and so far as Bengal was concerned, he was for a considerable period their secret leader and inspirer. The liberation of the Motherland from the foreign yoke was the paramount consideration for Aurobindo and he considered all means, including violence, justified to achieve that goal.

Another contribution of Aurobnido was lofty ideal of human unity and India's destined role in the international community. At a time when British rule in India was firmly and securely established, Aurobindo had the breadth of vision to foresee India as a free nation and her contribution to the world community. He felt that India had a spiritual message which was urgently needed by the people of the world. He was convinced that a free India was to fulfil her true destiny in the international community.

His ideal of human unity was one of his major contributions to modern Indian political theory. Although at the time he wrote, the idea was mainly

of academic interest, but it had the effect of raising the whole tone of the national movement and placing before it the ideal of human unity. (Prophet of Indian Nationalism, pp. 148-154).

Dr. V. P. Varma also emphasises the contribution of Aurobindo to the political throught of modern India. According to him, Aurobindo emphasized the importance of the inner freedom of human spirit. He supplemented the demand for political freedom with the quest for spiritual freedom. He emphasized the importance, dignity and divine essence of the individual. He made a distinction between moral Swaraj and political independence. His view was that mere political freedom from alien rule would not solve the problems of man. Political independence should be supplemented with inner Swaraj or mastery over one's lower passion. Aurobindo advocated a synthesis of external and inner freedom. In spite of his enthusiasm for spiritual individualism, he did not ignore the socialising role of the state. The central point in the philosophy of Aurobindo was his concept of freedom and he put emphasis on moral and spiritual freedom. He pleaded for a synthesis of liberty, equality, unity, peace and fraternity. Another contribution of Aurobindo was his theory of an exalted, purified and sanctified nationalism. He had the vision and boldness to preach absolute independence for India in 1907. He gave a new lease of life to idealism in politics. He gave a pure system of idealistic political philosophy. He gave a vital message to man. He tried to meet the challenge of the modern world in the form of materialism, naturalism, critical rationalism, biological vitalism and atheism. He had a subtle, and sympathetic mind. He was constructive in his philosophic approach. Dr. V. P. Varma concludes thus, "Aurobindo will be hailed not only as a mighty prophet of humanity, not only as one of the leaders of Indian renaissance and liberation, not only as a Yogi, poet, metaphysician and critic, but also as a leader in idealistic political theory." (The Political Philosophy of Sri Aurobindo, pp. 381-384, 433-39).

SUGGESTED READINGS

Aurobindo, Sri : *Sri Aurobindo on Himself and on the Mother*, 1953.

Aurobindo, Sri : *Speeches*, Third Edition, 1952.

Aurobindo, Sri : *Bankim-Tilak-Dayanand*, Calcutta, 1940.

Aurobindo, Sri : *The Doctrine of Passive Resistance*, 1948.

Aurobindo, Sri : *The Renaissance in India*, 1947.

Diwakar, R.R. : *Mahayogi Sri Aurobindo*, Bombay, 1954.

Gandhi, Kishore (Ed.) : *Contemporary Relevance of Sri Aurobindo*, Vivek, 1973.

Ghose, H.P. : *Aurobindo, the Prophet of Indian Nationalism*, Calcutta, 1919.

Gokak, V.K. : *Sri Aurobindo : Seer and Poet*, New Delhi, 1973.

Gupta, Nalini Kant : *A Century's Salutation to Sri Aurobindo*, Pondicherry.

Iyengar, K.R. Srinivasa : *Sri Aurobindo : A Biography and a History*, Vols. I and II, 1945.

Joshi, V.C. (Ed.) : *Sri Aurobindo, An Interpretation*, Vikas, 1973.

Karan Singh : *Prophet of Indian Nationalism : A Study of the Political Thought of Sri Aurobindo Ghosh*, Bombay, 1963.

Keshavmurti : *Sri Aurobindo.*

Langley, G.H. : *Sri Aurobindo : Poet, Philosopher and Mystic.*

Manoj Das : *Sri Aurobindo* New Delhi, 1972.

Manoj Das : *Sri Aurobindo—In the first Decade of the Century*, Pondicherry.

Mitra, Sisir Kumar : *Sri Aurobindo*, New Delhi, 1972.
Mitra, Sisir Kumar : *Sri Aurobindo and Indian Freedom.*
Mukherjee, Haridas & Uma : *Sri Aurobindo's Political Thought*, 1958.
Navajata : *Sri Aurobindo*, New Delhi, 1976.
Prema, Nandkumar : *Sri Aurobindo.*
Purani, A.B. : *The Life of Sri Aurobindo.*
Rolland, Romain : *Prophets of New India.*
Sethna, K.D. : *The Vision and Work of Sri Aurobindo*, Pondicherry, 1968.
Sarma, G.N. and Moin Shakir : *Politics and Society : Rammohan Roy to Nehru*, Aurangabad, 1963.
Varma, V.P. : *Political Philosophy of Sri Aurobindo*, Bombay, 1960.

CHAPTER XIX

The Revolutionary Terrorist Movement and Thought

Many causes were responsible for the rise and growth of the revolutionary terrorist movement in India. The Revolt of 1857 had its effect on the future generations of India. The sacrifices made by the Indians on that occasion gave inspiration to many to follow their example. The spirit of revenge with which the rebels of 1857 were crushed and innocent Indians were massacred by the British soldiers even after the failure of the Revolt, inflamed the minds of many Indians. There was a general awakening in the country and the people started thinking in terms of ending the foreign rule at any cost even if the use of force was necessary for that purpose. The timidity of the Moderates exasperated the youth of India and they decided to take to violence to turn out the foreigners from the country. The Indian press was instrumental in putting the Indian case before the people and asked for action against British tyranny in the country. The minds of the Indians were also affected by the large number of political assassinations in Europe at the hands of the anarchists. Those murders took place a few years before the partition of Bengal in 1905 and naturally their effect on the youth of India was bound to be profound. The unification of Germany and Italy, the defeat of Italy by Abyssinia in 1896 and of Russia by Japan in 1905, the Nihilist movement in Russia and the Young Turk movement in Turkey had their effect on the revolutionaries in India. Many people in India were convinced that the British rule in India could not be ended by constitutional methods and force had to be employed for that purpose. Those revolutionaries believed in the philosophy of bomb and pistol in one hand and the Gita in the other.

Maharashtra

Maharashtra was an important centre of the activity of the revolutionary terrorists. It was in that land that Shivaji had raised the standard of revolt and laid the foundations of the great Maratha Empire. It was from Poona that the first three Peshwas exercised their spiritual and secular authority. The heroic deeds of Nana Saheb and Tantia Tope fired the imagination of the youth of Maharashtra.

The name of Vasudeo Balwant Phadke (1845-82) stands foremost in the revolutionary movement in Maharashtra. He started the first revolutionary society in Maharashtra. He collected arms and ammunition to turn out the British from India. He created a reign of terror in seven districts of Maharashtra.

Damodar Chapekar was another hero of the same type. He called upon the Indians to take a pledge to fight to the last breath and die bravely but not without tainting the earth red with English blood. When Mr. Rand, Plague Commissioner of Poona and Mr. Ayerst were coming back from the

Government House on 22 June 1897, they were shot dead by Damodar Chapekar. The result was that he and a few others were hanged by the Government.

Tilak also played an important part in furthering the cause of the revolutionary terrorist movement in Maharashtra. In 1895, he inaugurated the Shivaji and Ganpati festivals. Fiery speeches were delieverd on those occasions. On 12 June 1897, Tilak called upon the people to "rise above the Penal Code in the rarified atmosphere of the sacred Bhagwat Gita." He justified the murder of Afzal Khan by Shivaji. He was arrested and sentenced to 18 months' rigorous imprisonment. There was a lot of political activity in Maharashtra. The statue of Queen Victoria was mutilated at Bombay. An attempt was made to burn the Church Mission Hall. The Marathi press was revolutionary in tone. The editors of many newspapers and magazines were arrested and sentenced. Tilak himself was arrested in 1908, prosecuted and convicted and sentenced to six years' transportation.

Ganesh Damodar Savarkar, the younger brother of V. D. Savarkar, was the head of the revolutionary activities at Nasik. He was the founder of the Abhinav Bharat Society. In April 1907, he printed the Marathi version of the authobiography of Mazzini. In 1909, he published a pamphlet which contained many inflammatory verses. In one of the poems he said, "Take up the sword and destroy the Government because it is foreign and aggressive." The title of another poem was: "Who obtained independence without a battle?" He was prosecuted and sentenced to transportation for life and his property was forfeited.

Mr. Jackson, the District Magistrate of Nasik who had convicted Ganesh Savarkar, was shot dead on 21 December 1909 by a member of the Abhinav Bharat Society.

Mr. Jackson had arrested Ganesh Savarkar on the instigation of Sir Curzon Willie and Sir Curzon was shot dead on 1 July 1909 by Madan Lal Dhingra. When he was arrested, a chit was recovered from his pocket which read as follows: "I attempted to shed English blood intentionally and with purpose as a humble protest against the inhuman transportation and hanging of Indian youth." At the time of his trial, he confessed that he had murdered Sir Curzon Willie. He declared that he had conspired with none except with his own duty. To quote him, "I believe that a nation held in bondage with the help of bayonets is in a state of perpetual war and since the guns are denied to me, I drew forth my pistol and attacked by surprise. What could a son poor in wealth and intellect like me offer to the Mother except my own blood? My only prayer to God is that I may again return to the same Mother and re-die in the same sacred cause till the Mother is freed for the service of humanity and glory of God." Madan Lal Dhingra was sentenced to death and hanged on 16 August 1909.

Bengal

The revolutionary terrorist movement was also strong in Bengal and Sri Aurobindo played an important part in it. He did not believe in loyal cooperation with the Government or asking for concessions. He stood for independence of his country which was to be achieved through strength, courage, manhood and suffering. To quote him, "What the Mother needs is hard clear steel for her sword, hard massive granite for her fortress, wood

CHAPTER XIX

The Revolutionary Terrorist Movement and Thought

Many causes were responsible for the rise and growth of the revolutionary terrorist movement in India. The Revolt of 1857 had its effect on the future generations of India. The sacrifices made by the Indians on that occasion gave inspiration to many to follow their example. The spirit of revenge with which the rebels of 1857 were crushed and innocent Indians were massacred by the British soldiers even after the failure of the Revolt, inflamed the minds of many Indians. There was a general awakening in the country and the people started thinking in terms of ending the foreign rule at any cost even if the use of force was necessary for that purpose. The timidity of the Moderates exasperated the youth of India and they decided to take to violence to turn out the foreigners from the country. The Indian press was instrumental in putting the Indian case before the people and asked for action against British tyranny in the country. The minds of the Indians were also affected by the large number of political assassinations in Europe at the hands of the anarchists. Those murders took place a few years before the partition of Bengal in 1905 and naturally their effect on the youth of India was bound to be profound. The unification of Germany and Italy, the defeat of Italy by Abyssinia in 1896 and of Russia by Japan in 1905, the Nihilist movement in Russia and the Young Turk movement in Turkey had their effect on the revolutionaries in India. Many people in India were convinced that the British rule in India could not be ended by constitutional methods and force had to be employed for that purpose. Those revolutionaries believed in the philosophy of bomb and pistol in one hand and the Gita in the other.

Maharashtra

Maharashtra was an important centre of the activity of the revolutionary terrorists. It was in that land that Shivaji had raised the standard of revolt and laid the foundations of the great Maratha Empire. It was from Poona that the first three Peshwas exercised their spiritual and secular authority. The heroic deeds of Nana Saheb and Tantia Tope fired the imagination of the youth of Maharashtra.

The name of Vasudeo Balwant Phadke (1845-82) stands foremost in the revolutionary movement in Maharashtra. He started the first revolutionary society in Maharashtra. He collected arms and ammunition to turn out the British from India. He created a reign of terror in seven districts of Maharashtra.

Damodar Chapekar was another hero of the same type. He called upon the Indians to take a pledge to fight to the last breath and die bravely but not without tainting the earth red with English blood. When Mr. Rand, Plague Commissioner of Poona and Mr. Ayerst were coming back from the

Government House on 22 June 1897, they were shot dead by Damodar Chapekar. The result was that he and a few others were hanged by the Government.

Tilak also played an important part in furthering the cause of the revolutionary terrorist movement in Maharashtra. In 1895, he inaugurated the Shivaji and Ganpati festivals. Fiery speeches were delieverd on those occasions. On 12 June 1897, Tilak called upon the people to "rise above the Penal Code in the rarified atmosphere of the sacred Bhagwat Gita." He justified the murder of Afzal Khan by Shivaji. He was arrested and sentenced to 18 months' rigorous imprisonment. There was a lot of political activity in Maharashtra. The statue of Queen Victoria was mutilated at Bombay. An attempt was made to burn the Church Mission Hall. The Marathi press was revolutionary in tone. The editors of many newspapers and magazines were arrested and sentenced. Tilak himself was arrested in 1908, prosecuted and convicted and sentenced to six years' transportation.

Ganesh Damodar Savarkar, the younger brother of V. D. Savarkar, was the head of the revolutionary activities at Nasik. He was the founder of the Abhinav Bharat Society. In April 1907, he printed the Marathi version of the authobiography of Mazzini. In 1909, he published a pamphlet which contained many inflammatory verses. In one of the poems he said, "Take up the sword and destroy the Government because it is foreign and aggressive." The title of another poem was: "Who obtained independence without a battle?" He was prosecuted and sentenced to transportation for life and his property was forfeited.

Mr. Jackson, the District Magistrate of Nasik who had convicted Ganesh Savarkar, was shot dead on 21 December 1909 by a member of the Abhinav Bharat Society.

Mr. Jackson had arrested Ganesh Savarkar on the instigation of Sir Curzon Willie and Sir Curzon was shot dead on 1 July 1909 by Madan Lal Dhingra. When he was arrested, a chit was recovered from his pocket which read as follows: "I attempted to shed English blood intentionally and with purpose as a humble protest against the inhuman transportation and hanging of Indian youth." At the time of his trial, he confessed that he had murdered Sir Curzon Willie. He declared that he had conspired with none except with his own duty. To quote him, "I believe that a nation held in bondage with the help of bayonets is in a state of perpetual war and since the guns are denied to me, I drew forth my pistol and attacked by surprise. What could a son poor in wealth and intellect like me offer to the Mother except my own blood? My only prayer to God is that I may again return to the same Mother and re-die in the same sacred cause till the Mother is freed for the service of humanity and glory of God." Madan Lal Dhingra was sentenced to death and hanged on 16 August 1909.

Bengal

The revolutionary terrorist movement was also strong in Bengal and Sri Aurobindo played an important part in it. He did not believe in loyal cooperation with the Government or asking for concessions. He stood for independence of his country which was to be achieved through strength, courage, manhood and suffering. To quote him, "What the Mother needs is hard clear steel for her sword, hard massive granite for her fortress, wood

that will not break for the handle of her bow, tough substance for the axle of her chariot. For the battle is near and the trumpet ready for the signal."

The revolutionary press in Bengal also helped the revolutionary terrorist movement. Day after day, it continued to point out the acts of omission and commission of the British Government in India. It put before the people examples from past history to show that independence could not be won without heroic deeds or martyrdom. An appeal was made to the people to adopt all possible methods to turn out the British from the country. Among the revolutionary papers, The Yugantar was the most violent. It called upon the people of India to sacrifice themselves at the altar of the Motherland. It asked every Bengalee to take a life before giving his life. To quote from The Yugantar, "We will bathe in the enemy's blood and with it dye Hindustan." The Bande Mataram edited by Aurobindo Ghosh was similar to the Yugantar. It declared: "The time is coming; the call will soon go forth for the hero, the martyr, the man of iron will, the grim fighter, the born leader in action, the priest of Kali who can tear his heart out of his body and offer as a bleeding sacrifice on the Mother's altar."

There was also revolutionary literature. Circulars like "Who is our King" and "Golden Bengal" were issued in 1906. Books entitled "Bartaman Rana-Niti (The Modern Art of War), Bhavani Mandir and Mukti Kon Pathe (What is Path of Salvation ?) were published and circulated among the people. Many revolutionary songs and poems were published.

Barindra Kumar Ghosh, the younger brother of Aurobindo Ghosh, and Upendranath Dutta, the brother of Swami Vivekanand, did a lot to help the cause of the revolutionary terrorist movement. Barindra Kumar started The Yugantar and through its columns carried on the work of educating the masses. The Yugantar preached rebellion against the Government.

As a result of the efforts made by Barindra Kumar Ghosh and Upendranath Dutta and their associates, a number of revolutionary-terrorist societies were set up and one of them was the Anusilan Samiti or Society for the promotion of culture and training. This society had its branches in Calcutta and Dacca. It was modelled on the lines of the secret societies of Italy and Russia. It embarked upon a programme of wholesale terrorism. On 6 December 1907, an attempt was made to blow up the train in which the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal was travelling. Barindra Kumar Ghosh was arrested and confessed his own guilt.

Mr. Allen who was formerly the District Magistrate of Dacca, was shot in the back on 23 December 1907. However, the injury was not fatal. On 30 April 1908, Mrs. Kennedy and Miss Kennedy were killed by a bomb thrown by Khudi Ram which was actually meant for Mr. Kingsford, Presidency Magistrate. Khudi Ram was arrested, tried and hanged. He became a martyr and a hero.

In the Alipore conspiracy case, searches were made by the police at Maniktala and elsewhere in Calcutta. In May 1908, bombs, dynamite, cartridges and correspondence were seized. Many persons were arrested, charged and convicted and heavy punishments were inflicted on them. Narinder Gosain became an approver but he was shot dead by his companions in

the jail. Nand Lal, the Sub-Inspector who had arrested Khudi Ram, was murdered. Asutosh Biswas who had acted as public prosecutor in the Gosain murder case and the Alipore conspiracy case was shot dead. Shams-ul-Alam, Deputy Superintendent of Police who was connected with the Alipore case, was shot dead. The revolutionaries killed all those who were suspected to be police informers. They also killed the public prosecutors, magistrates, police officers, witnesses, traitors, betrayers and approvers, unmindful of the consequences.

The Government adopted all preventive and repressive measures to crush the revolutionary terrorist movement. Many revolutionary societies such as the Calcutta Anusilan Samiti, the Swadesh Bandhav Samiti at Bakerganj, the Barati Samiti at Faridpur and the Suhrid and Sadhana Samities of Mymensingh were declared illegal and all those associated with them were arrested and punished.

The Punjab

The Punjab also played its part in the revolutionary movement. The Punjabees detested the policy of repression followed by the British Government in India. They also protested against the treatment given to them in various parts of the British Empire. Sardar Ajit Singh, a revolutionary of the Bharat Mata Society of Lahore, took an active part against the Colonisation Act which deprived the peasants of their lands. There were disturbances in May 1907 and many leaders were arrested and prosecuted. Sufi Amba Prasad was the editor of the Bharat Mata and was considered to be the most dangerous enemy as well as the brain of the revolutionary movement in the Punjab. On 23 December 1912, when Lord Hardinge was being taken in a procession in Delhi, a bomb exploded which injured the Viceroy and killed his A.D.C. The action taken by the Government is known as the Delhi Conspiracy case, 13 persons were arrested. Two of them were sentenced to seven years' imprisonment and four were hanged, It is said that when Avadh Behari was going to be hanged, an Englishman asked him what his last wish was and his reply was: "The end of the British rule." When the Englishman advised him to die peacefully, he replied, "Peace! I wish that a conflagration may break out in the country gutting the British rule. Let my country emerge out of this fire like pure gold."

Lala Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh were deported to Mandalay in June 1907. There were strong protests by the national leaders and pressure was put on Lord Morley who was the Secretary of State for India at that time. The result was that Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh were released. After his release, Ajit Singh and his other comrades resumed revolutionary activities particularly in the form of distribution of revolutionary literature. The Government once again adopted all conceivable measures of repression to handle the situation. The security measures were tightened to such an extent that it became more or less impossible to carry on revolutionary work in the Punjab. Ajit Singh accompanied by Sufi Amba Prasad escaped to Afghanistan.

The Punjabi militants shifted their base to foreign countries. In Europe, men like Lala Hardayal and Bhai Parmanand worked with Shyamji Krishna Verma (1851-1930), Madam Cama and V. D. Savarkar. Madan Lal

Dhingra, an engineering student from Amritsar, shot dead in July 1909, Sir William Curzon Willie who was responsible for the death of a number of youngmen and transportation for life of Ganesh Savarkar. The fearlessness of Dhingra was praised by the revolutionary group in Europe and India. Even Lloyd George praised the conduct of Dhingra as a patriot. Winston Churchill quoted with admiration Dhingra's last words as the finest ever made in the name of patriotism. They compared Dhingra with Plutarch's "immortal heroes." Irish newspapers paid glowing tributes to Dhingra. Huge placards like "Ireland honours Madan Lal Dhingra who was proud to lay down his life for the sake of his country", were displayed. Commenting on the role of patriotism after the incident, W.S. Blunt wrote in his diary, "People talk about political assassination defeating its own end, but that is nonsense. It is just the shock needed to convince selfish rulers that selfishness had its limits of impudence. It is like the other fiction that England has her face slapped, she apologised, not before."

The Ghadar Party

During the period 1909-15, there was a revolutionary upsurge among the Indians in Canada and the United States. The Canadian Government adopted a policy of racial discrimination in the matter of the immigration of the Punjabis to Canada. The Indians were also humiliated in Canada and the United States. The result was that an organisation called the Ghadar Party initially called "Hindustani Association of the Pacific Coast" was established at Portland in the United States in 1913 under the Presidentship of Sohan Singh Bhakhana with Lala Hardayal, Pandit Kashiram, Bhai Parmanand, Kartar Singh Saraba and Ram Chandra as its active members. The Party decided to work for the liberation of India by inculcating patriotic fervour among the Indians overseas and preparing them to participate in an armed revolt against the British rulers. The programme of the party included work among the troops, assassination of officials, publication of revolutionary and anti-imperialist literature and procurement of arms. The party aimed at bringing about a simultaneous revolt in all the British colonies. The Party advertised: "Wanted brave soldiers to stir up Ghadar in India. Pay—death; Price—martyrdom; Pension—liberty; Field—India". Full advantage was taken of the humiliation of the Indians at the hands of the Canadian Government in the Kamagata Maru incident in 1914.

When the World War I broke out in 1914, the Ghadarites decided to return to India and organise a revolt. They wanted to take advantage of the difficult position of the British armies engaged in crucial battles on various fronts in Europe and Asia. Addressing the emigrants on board, Ram Chandra, a leading member of the Ghadar Party, said, "Your duty is clear. Go to India. Stir up rebellion in every corner of the country. Rob the wealthy and show mercy to the poor. In this way, gain universal sympathy. Arms will be provided for you on arrival in India. Failing this, you must ransack police stations for rifles. Obey without hesitation the command of your leaders."

Many of the members of the Ghadar Party travelled back to India in the Kamagata Maru and Tosa Maru ships. As a result of the prompt action taken by the authorities in India, 400 out of 8000 passengers who returned during the first two years of the War, were arrested. 2500 persons were

interned in their villages and the remaining 500 were kept under strict watch. Those who escaped from the hands of the police, tried to carry out their plans like working among the peasantry, seduction of the army, procurement of arms, manufacture of bombs, the commission of dacoities, looting of Treasuries and Thanas or police stations, recruitment of youngmen for revolutionary work and distribution of Ghadar literature. Some of them penetrated into the army, organised secret cells to give the soldiers political education and incited them against the foreign rulers in India. A number of dacoities were committed by the Ghadarites between December 1914 and February 1915. Cyclostyled copies of the Ailan-i-Jung were distributed among the peasantry and the urban youth in large numbers. Rash Bihari Bose took command of this organisation and fixed the night of 21 February 1915 for a general uprising of the Indian troops. Vigorous preparations were made and Rash Bihari Bose, Sachindranath Sanyal, Pingale and Baghi Kartar Singh prepared a master plan for the purpose. Unfortunately one Kirpal Singh passed on all the secret plans to the Government. Many places were raided and bombs were recovered. Secret papers were also captured by the Government. Most of the ring leaders of the Punjab fell into the hands of the police. Rash Bihari Bose escaped. By August 1915, most of the Ghadarite leaders fell into the hands of the authorities. Special tribunals were appointed by the Government of India under the Defence of India Act to try the Ghadarite revolutionaries. There was no right of appeal to a higher court against the judgements of the tribunals. The accused were tried in nine batches in the Lahore conspiracy case and supplementary cases. Out of 291 persons sent up for trial, 42 were sentenced to death and hanged and 114 were transported for life. 93 persons were imprisoned for varying terms and 42 were acquitted. Baghi Kartar Singh and Pingale admitted that they were wholly responsible for the conspiracy.

During World War I, Lala Hardayal (1884-1939) went to Germany to negotiate with William II, the German Emperor and he sent thousands of recruits and a lot of explosive material to India. Raja Mahendra Pratap set up a Provisional Government at Kabul with a view to stirring up rebellion in India. A Pan-Islamic movement was started in India and 15 Mohammadan students left their colleges at Lahore in February 1915 and joined the Mujahaddin-a-Wahabi sect. Some other Punjabi Muslims also crossed the Indian borders to join the holy war and made common cause with the revolutionaries at Kabul. The attempt to inform their counterparts in India about the activities of the Provisional Government and the Army of God remained only on paper. The revolutionary terrorist movement in the Punjab and other parts of India lay dormant during the War years 1915-1918 owing to the policy of severe repression followed by the Government of India and the Provincial Governments.

Post-War Revolutionary Movement

There was the revival of revolutionary terrorist activity in the country when the people were suffering from a sense of frustration and pessimism after agitations and demonstrations against the Rowlatt Bills, the Non-cooperation movement and the Khilafat movement. The revolutionaries put before the youngmen of the country a new programme. They called upon them to start a revolutionary and uncompromising struggle for the independence of their country. They tried to impress upon the people of India the

secret of the British character that they could be bullied but not argued into justice and generosity. The terrorism of the Government was to be met by counter-terrorism. Such a policy alone could restore self-confidence among the people who were suffering from a sense of utter helplessness. The revolutionaries believed that the English masters and their hired lackeys should not be allowed to do whatever they liked unhampered and unmolested and every possible difficulty and resistance must be thrown in their way. The terrorists made it clear that they did not believe in terrorism for its own sake. They resorted to it only as an effective means of retaliation. The revolutionaries believed that the repressive measures of the Government had destroyed all hope of political reform being gained without violence. Moreover, armed resistance against something "Satanic and ignoble" was infinitely more befitting for any nation than the prevalence of "effortless and philosophical cowardice." The revolutinoaries went to the villages not to get votes but to secure "co-martyrs" for the country who would die without anybody knowing where their corpses lay. They would like to go down in history unknown, unhonoured, unsung, unlamented and unwept. These mad lovers of the country were not actuated by avarice, rivalry, jealousy or enmity. They were inspired by the divine motives of devotion and service. They were above sectarian and communal considerations. Unlike the previous movement, religion was not allowed to have precedence over the secular and nationalistic outlook of its organisers who belonged to different religious groups in the, country. The revolutionary brotherhood had reached a stage where there was no caste, no religion or even separate identity.

There was a fundamental difference between the pre-1919 phase and post-1919 phase of the revolutionary terrorist movement. The pre-1919 revolutionaries were inspired by Mazzini and Garibaldi of Italy and Sinn Feinners of Ireland. The post-1919 revolutionaries derived their inspiration from the October Revolution of Russia and the socialistic principles of the Soviet leaders like Lenin. The slogans and code words like "Bharat Mata Ki Jai", "Bande Mataram", "Om", "Ram Hari", "Allaho Akbar", and "Sat Sri Akal" were substituted by "Inqilab Zindabad", "Down with Imperialism", "Long Live the Proletariat" and "Long Live India." A leaflet issued by Naujawan Bharat Subha discarded Buddha and Christ and described Karl Marx and Engels as the greatest men of the world. While the old revolutionaries got their inspiration from the Bhagwat Gita and the writings of Aurobnido, Vivekananda and Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, the new revolutionaries got their inspiration from the writings of Marx and Engels. While the revolutionaries like Lala Hardayal and his followers thought in terms of the past glory of ancient India, Bhagat Singh and his comrades relied upon the master-pieces of Lenin and such books as "Roos Ki Rajya Kranti".

The revolutionaries lived a life of sufferings, hardships, insults and humiliations at the hands of the agents of the foreign Governments. They believed that no weapon could kill them and no fire could burn them. They were prepared in mind and body to pass through the severest ordeals. They were transported for life to the Andaman Islands where life was extremely difficult. The jail authorities invented various devices to make the revolutionaries as miserable as they could. Barbarous punishments were inflicted upon them to extort confession or to convert them as approvers. Their hands were kept under the legs of the cots and the police constables sat on

them. Sometimes they were wrapped in a blanket and then mercilessly beaten to avoid legal complications. Sometimes they were made to stand on their legs for days together with their hands tied with a chain nailed in the wall. Sometimes they had to wear cross-bars which were worse than the bar fetters because the prisoners under this sentence could not bring their feet or legs close to each other and they had to walk, sit, work and sleep with stretched out feet and legs for weeks. Sometimes the revolutionaries resorted to hunger strike to remonstrate against the inhuman treatment meted out to them. Whenever an official was murdered, there was praise instead of condemnation. Whenever a revolutioary was hanged, he was praised as a courageous hero and a martyr.

Babbar Akali Movement

The Babbar Akali movement led by Master Mota Singh, Kishan Singh, Amar Singh, Bela Singh and Tota Singh was started in 1921. It was a religio-political movement and was a reaction against the atrocities committed at Nankana Sahib and Taran Taran. Michel O' Dwyer, the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, called it the nucleus of the new revolutionary movement of the Akali Sikhs. The Babbar Akali Jatha was against the non-violent methods of Gandhiji and believed that they could not get justice in a court of law. They impressed upon the people that freedom could not be won without armed struggle and called upon them to take to arms.

The Babbars drew a programme for murdering some of the Government agents and police informers. In order to spare harassment of innocent persons, they decided to own the responsibility through their organ—Babbar Akali Doaba Akhabar. A number of Government officials and British agents were killed in Jullundur and Hoshiarpur districts. However, many Babbar leaders were arrested. Many of them died while fighting. 91 Babbars were tried in the Babbar Akali case. Three of them died in jails, 12 were sentenced to transportation for life and 38 to different terms of imprisonment. Kishen Singh, Karam Singh, Manko, Santa Singh, Dharam Singh, Dalip Singh etc. were sentenced to death and executed on 27 February, 1926. The Babbar Akali movement lasted for five years from 1921 to 1926. The valour and sacrifices of the Babbars left a great impression on the minds of the people of the Punjab, particularly the youth. Some of them became legendary heroes. The revolutionary terrorist cult of the Ghadar Party and the Babbar Akalis appealed to the youth of the Punjab.

It is worthy of notice that the terrorist movements up to now were inspired by patriotic motives and were influenced by the developments in the foreign countries, particularly the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. However, none of them had any firm ideological commitment. They did not talk in terms of the social transformation of the society. It is true that Ajit Singh called the peasants the real rulers of the country and the Government as their Kamins or servants, but there is no evidence to show that he aimed at the establishment of workers' and peasants' rule after the achievement of Independence. He also did not make any distinction between the Zamindars and the peasants. As a matter of fact, the whole struggle was for the preservation of land rights. Even the leaders of the Ghadar Party had one aim and that was to free the country from foreign yoke.

Kakori Case

The revolutionaries were in great need of money for the manufacture of bombs and consequently a few of them boarded a railway train on 9 August 1925 on the Lucknow-Saharanpur line. They had with them revolvers and cartridges. After the departure of the train from the Kakori Railway Station, one of the revolutionaries pulled the alarm chain of the train. The iron box was opened which was found to contain Rs. 5000 only. The Government took action and arrested about 40 persons. The trial was a mere farce. Pandit Ram Prasad Bismil, Roshan Singh and Rajinder Lahiri were awarded death sentences. Manmathnath Gupta got 14 years. Ashfaq Ullah Khan and Sachendranath Bakshi were caught later on and given death sentence and transportation for life respectively.

On 3 October 1925, the Hindustan Republican Association (HRA) was started in Uttar Pradesh under the leadership of Sachindranath Sanyal. Similar organisations were set up in other provinces. The most important among them were the Hindustan Sewa Dal, the Gupta Samiti and the Naujawan Bharat Sabha.

Naujawan Bharat Sabha

The Naujawan Bharat Sabha was organised in 1926 by Bhagat Singh, Chabbil Das and Yash Pal. Its political aims were to establish a complete independent republic of the labourers and peasants in the whole of India, to infuse a spirit of patriotism into the hearts of the youth of the country in order to establish a united Indian nation, to express sympathy with and to assist the economic, industrial and social movements which while being free from communal sentiments, were intended to take us nearer to our goal namely, the establishment of a completely independent republic of labourers and peasants and to organise labourers and peasants. The programme of the Sabha consisted of debates on moral, literary and social subjects. The Sabha urged the youngmen of India to follow the example set by the Ghadar heroes and the youth of Ireland, Turkey, Japan and China in their struggle for independence and exhorted them to study the Communist and Bolshevist movements. It celebrated "Friends of Russia Week" and "Kakori Day."

On 8 and 9 September 1928, all the prominent workers and leaders of the various revolutionary organisations in the various provinces met in a conference at Ferozeshah Kotla grounds in Delhi and formed an all-India political body known as Hindustan Socialist Republican Association (Army) (HSRA) to centralise the work of all revolutionary parties. Chandrasekhar Azad was appointed the Commander-in-Chief of the Association. Chief organisers were appointed for Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Punjab and Rajputana. Vijay Kumar Sinha and Bhagat Singh were required to ensure inter-provincial coordinaiton. The headquaraters of the Party were kept at Agra. The Association decided to invite bomb workers from Bengal to give training to its members. It was declared that funds will be raised by organising raids on banks, post offices and Government treasuries to bring about an armed revolution in the country. Another programme of the Association was to organise the Hindustan Socialist Republican Army and recruit members from the radical youngmen from rural and urban areas. Though they decried

terrorism theoretically, they justified it as a means for achieving their revolutionary end. To them, terrorism was a "necessary, inevitable phase of the revolution." Their Manifesto said, "Terrorism is not complete without Revolution and the revolution is not complete without terrorism. Terrorism instils fear in the hearts of the oppressors; it brings hopes of revenge and redemption to the oppressed masses; it gives courage and self-confidence to the wavering; it shatters the spell of the superiority of the ruling class and raises the status of the subject race in the eyes of the world because it is the most convincing proof of a nation's hunger for freedom." At a time when almost all avenues of expression against the British Government were closed, terrorism seemed to them to be the only effective tool. They believed that terrorism in India would develop into a revoluiton. Their slogan was, "We ask not for mercy and we give no quarter. Ours is a war to the end—to victory or death."

Death of Lajpat Rai

The Simon Commission visited Lahore on 20 October in 1928. The Hindustan Socialist Republican Party took out a huge procession against the Simon Commission under the leadership of Lala Lajpat Rai. One Mr. I. P. Saunders gave blows on the head and chest of Lala Lajpat Rai with his baton and thereby caused grievous injuries on his person. As a result of the injuries received by him, Lala Lajpat Rai died on 17 November 1928. The revolutionaries decided to have revenge. On 17 December 1928, Saunders was shot by Raj Guru who was followed by Bhagat Singh who tore the head of Saunders to pieces by pistol shots.

The Public Safety Bill and the Trade Disputes Act were rejected by the Central Legislative Assembly but in spite of that those were promulgated by the Viceroy. This gave an opportunity to the revolutionaries to demonstrate to the Indian public the futility of parliamentary constitutional methods of struggle. Bhagat Singh and B. K. Dutt threw bombs in the Central Hall of the Assembly in New Delhi on 8 April 1929 to protest against those bills. The bombs did little damage. They were meant merely to create a big noise and attract the attention of the country. After throwing pamphlets all around, Bhagat Singh and B. K. Dutt shouted: "Long Live Revolution", "Down with Imperialism" and "Workers of the World Unite." They could have managed to run away but surrendered themselves to the police. In their statement in the court on 6 June 1929, they admitted their guilt but explained the motives of their action which was not directed against any individual but only wanted to demonstrate to the world India's humiliation and helplessness. It symbolised the over-riding domination of an irresponsible and autocratic rule—an institution that stood as a menacing movement to the strangling power of exploiters and the serfdom of the helpless labourers. Their action was intended to register protest on behalf of those who had no other means left to give expression to their heart-rending agony. It was to make the deaf hear and to give the heedless a timely warning. It was to mark the end of the era of Utopian non-violence of whose futility the rising generations had been fully convinced. It was also intended to emphasize the historical lesson that Lettre de cachets and Bastilles could not crush the revolutionary movement in France and Siberian mines could not extinguish the Russian revolution. Ordinances and safety bills could not snuff out the flame of freedom in India. Both

Bhagat Singh and B. K. Dutt were convicted and sentenced to transportation for life.

Lahore Conspiracy Case (1930)

Proceedings were started for the trial of those who were responsible for the murder of Saunders on 17 December 1928. Bhagat Singh was one of the accused in that case which is known as the Lahore Conspiracy case. This case attracted wide attention and the revolutionaries carried on their struggle in the courts also by raising slogans and offering resistance when they were taken to the court handcuffed. They went on hunger-strike which lasted for 63 days against their treatment in jails. Jatin Das, one of the revolutionaries, died while on hunger strike. The trial lasted for nine months during which little progress was made. By a special Ordinance, the Viceroy ordered that the revolutionaries be tried under the "Lahore Conspiracy Case Ordinance of 1930." Under that Ordinance, a special tribunal was set up which required no lawyers, no defence witnesses and no presence of the accused in the court. The judgement was given by the tribunal in October 1930. Bhagat Singh, Raj Guru and Sukh Dev were awarded death sentence. On 17 February 1931 was observed as "Bhagat Singh Day" throughout the province. Dr. Satya Pal paid his tribute in these words, "These people dry up the gulf between life and death with their courage and perserverance." Subhas Chandra Bose remarked that, "Long Live Bhagat Singh" and "Long Live Revolution" meant one and the same thing. Mahatma Gandhi observed, "There had never been within living memory so much romance around any life as had surrounded that of Bhagat Singh." On 23 March 1931, Bhagat Singh, Raj Guru and Sukh Dev were executed.

About the revolutionary terrorist movement in Northern India in the 1920s, Prof. Bipan Chandra had made certain observations. According to him.[1] a major influence on the young revolutionaries was the Russian Revolution and the suuccess of the young socialist state in consolidating itself against heavy internal odds and powerful external enemies. That led them to study Marxist literature and other books on socialism. Bhagat Singh and Sukh Dev began to look upon the Soviet Union as the state nearest to their ideal. On 24 January 1930, the Lahore conspiracy case prisoners celebrated the "Lenin Day" in the court and sent greetings to Moscow. In November 1930, they sent greetings to the Soviet Union on the anniversary of the Revolution. The revolutionary terrorists took monetary and other help from the Soviet Union and sent Indians to the Soviet Union to get training in the arts, methods and organisation of the revolutionary process. In 1926. Ashfaq Ullah Khan of the Hindustan Republican Association was planning to go to Russia when he was arrested in the Kakori conspiracy case. In 1928, B. K. Sinha was deputed by the Hindustan Socialist Republican (Army) Association to go to the Soviet Union. Chandrasekhar Azad made attempts to send Yash Pal and Surender Pande to the Soviet Union. The influence of the Russian Revolution was a major factor in spreading socialist ideas among the revolutionaries. The revolutionary terrorists established contacts with the Communist groups in India, particularly at Kanpur and Allahabad. During the yeras 1928-1930, the Communist groups and the revolutionary terrorists worked together in the Naujawan Bharat Sabha.

1. *Nationalism and Colonialism in Modern India*, pp. 223-47.

The revolutionary terrorists of the new generation were men of ideas and ideologies. Bhagat Singh and Bhagwati Charan were men of exceptionally powerful intellect and capacity to translate their ideas into written word. The draft of "The Philosophy of the Bomb" was written by Bhagwati Charan at the instance of Chandrashekhar Azad and after a full discussion with him.

The greatest advance made by the revolutionary terrorists was in the definition and development of their aims and objectives. Their first major commitment was to liberate India from foreign rule and to transform Indian society through a revolution. Their commitment to revolution was total. To them, revolution was not a mere historical accident or curiosity. It was not merely the demand of a particular historical situation in India. It was "an inalienable right of mankind." It was the eternal principle of human progress. It was the very embodiment of humanist principles. According to the Manifesto of the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association of 1929, "Revolution is a phenomenon which nature loves and without which there can be no progress either in nature or in human affairs. Revolution is not a philosophy of despair or a creed of desperadoes. Revolution may be anti-God but is certainly not anti-men. It is a vital, living force which is indicative of eternal conflict between the Old and the New, between Life and Living Death, between light and darkness. There is no concord, no symphony, no rhythm without Revolution. 'The music of the spheres' of which poets have sung, would remain an unreality if a ceaseless Revolution were to be eliminated from the space. **Revolution is Law, Revolution is Order and Revolution is the Truth.**" The revolutionaries were not afraid of chaos or anarchy which frightened the middle class intelligentsia of that time. The task of destruction was essential before regeneration could take place. Revolution implied total struggle—a struggle without compromises, a struggle in which the victory had to be total.

Bhagat Singh and others declared that Revolution was not to be identified with violence or with the cult of the pistol and bomb. Those were, when found necessary in some cases, the mere means of bringing about revolution. Revolution was not to be seen as a mere political act. That is why a rebellion was not a revolution though it might lead to it. Revolution had a deeper, wider social content. Its aim was to regenerate society and to change the social order based on "manifest injustice." Revolution was "the spirit, the longing for a change for the better." It was the desire of the people to change their political and economic condition. Bhagwati Charan defined revolution as "Independence, social, political and economic." In their statement before the court on 6 June 1929, Bhagat Singh and B.K. Dutt declared, "By revolution we mean the ultimate establishment of an order of society which may not be threatened by such (social) breakdown and in which the sovereignty of the proletariat shall be recognised and as a result of which a world federation should redeem humanity from the bondage of capitalism and misery of imperial wars."

The revolutionary terrorists were not satisfied with the mere prospects of the achievement of complete national independence. Even national freedom had to be seen as a means to new social order. The Hindustan Republican Association declared in 1925 that it stood for "the abolition of all

systems which make the exploitation of man by man possible." The poster put up at Lahore after the assassination of Saunders in December 1928 declared that the revolutionaries were working "for a revolution which would end exploitation of man by man." "The philosophy of the bomb" invited the readers to help establish "a new order of society in which political and economic exploitation will be an impossibility. Socialism became the official goal of the revolutionary terrorists after their meeting at Delhi in September 1928. The word "socialist" was added to the name of the Party. Gradually, more and more revolutionaries came under the influence of socialist ideas. Many of them were in touch with the Communist groups. While in jail, Bhagat Singh wrote several books of which the four prominent ones were "Autobiography", "The Door to Death," "The Ideal of Socialism" and the "Revolutionary Movement of India." However, all the manuscripts have been lost.

It is contended that Bhagat Singh and his friends were not great scholars of socialism or Marxism but they were not mere novices also. They were gradually feeling, studying and thinking their way towards a scientific socialist understanding of the problems of the Indian revolution.

The leaders of the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association knew full well that socialism was a product of the historical process and as a system, it was the antithesis of capitalism. Therefore, the first achievement of the socialist system would be the ending of capitalism. That was made clear by Bhagat Singh and B. K. Dutt in their statement in the court on 6 June 1929.

It was recognised that socialism would represent a new co-relation of class forces in society. The entire socialist ideology was based on class analysis of society. Socialism would be based on the emancipation of the exploited classes of society, the workers and peasants and the domination of their interests in the economy, society and polity. A similar view was expressed by Bhagat Singh and B. K. Dutt in the court on 6 June 1929. To quote from that statement, "Producers or labourers, in spite of being the most necessary element of society, are robbed by their exploiters of the fruits of their labour and deprived of their elementary rights. On the one hand, the peasant who grows corn for all starves with his family. The weaver who supplies the world market with his textile fabrics cannot find enough to cover his own and his children's bodies. Masons, smiths and carpenters who rear magnificant palaces, live and perish in slums, and on the other hand, capitalist exploiters, parasites of society, squander millions on their whims. Radical change, therefore, is necessary and it is the duty of those who realise this to organise society on a socialistic basis."

The view of the leaders of the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association was that socialism represented a new state structure in which power rests in the hands of the workers and peasants. Socialism could not be established till the existing state apparatus, under the control of the exploiting classes, was captured by the socialist revolutionary forces. Bhagat Singh wrote in October 1930, "We mean by revolution the uprooting of the present social order. For this, capture of state power is necessary. The state apparatus is now in the hands of the privileged class. The protection of the interests of the masses, the translation of our ideal into reality, that

is the laying of the foundation of society in accordance with the principles of Karl Marx, demand our seizure of this apparatus."

It was stated in "The Philosophy of the Bomb" that the Revolution will "establish the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and will for ever banish social parasites from the seat of political power." When the judgement was announced on 13 June 1929 in the Assembly Bomb Case, Bhagat Singh and B. K. Dutt raised in the court the slogans of "Long Live Revolution" and "Long Live the Proletariat." During the trial of the Lahore conspiracy case in 1930, all the prisoners used to shout three slogans on their arrival in the court: "Long Live Revolution", "Long Live the Proletariat" and "Down with Imperialism".

The revolutionary terrorists constantly linked up imperialism with capitalism. Within India foreign rule was seen a form of class rule or the rule of foreign capitalists and socialism was seen as a specific remedy that would put an end to class rule and economic exploitation and bring about true independence. The manifesto of the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association said, "The hope of the proletariat is, therefore, now centred on socialism which alone can lead to the establishment of complete Independence and the removal of all social distinctions and privileges." The revolutionary terrorists ranged themselves against the exploiting classes in India also and denounced the domination of Indian capitalists and landlords as strongly as the rule of foreign capital and declared that the abolition of the former was as basic to the revolution as the abolition of the latter.

On the question of the social base of the revolution, the leadership of the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association was very clear. Their movement was to be based on the common people, the workers and peasants, the youth and the radical intelligentsia. The Manifesto of the Naujawan Bharat Sabha of 1928 said, "The future programme of preparing the country will begin with the motto 'Revolution by the masses and for the masses'". The Naujawan Bharat Sabha decided to open branches in villages in order to emphasize the importance of the work in the rural areas. It was decided at a meeting of the Central Council of the Hindustan Socialist Republican Association in January 1930 to intensify the work among the students, peasants and workers. The revolutionary leaders were convinced that the capitalists and upper classes were showing a tendency to join the foreign power and were likely to abandon the freedom struggle half-way through and only the common people had the strength and could be relied upon to carry forward the struggle for freedom. To quote Bhagat Singh, "The nation can wage a successful struggle only on the strength of organised workers, Kisans and the common people."

However, it is pointed out that in practice, very little effort was made to organise the common people. The Naujawan Bharat Sabha did take part in one or two agrarian agitations in 1928 and called upon the peasants to organise themselves but for all practical purposes, its activities were confined to cities and their middle and lower middle class sectors. Although the Central Council decided in January 1930 to intensify work among the peasants, workers and students, no one was assigned to work among the peasants. The revolutionaries failed to do any political work among the

common people and were virtually cut off from them. Their main appeal was to the radical nationalist youth who were to act the conveyors of the revolutoinary socialist message to the workers and peasants and also fight for revolution. The youth was to be the vanuguard of the revolution. One reason for the emphasis on the youth was the understanding that the task of the present generation of revolutionaries was not to make the revolution but to prepare for it. Bhagat Singh looked upon himself as the precursor of the revolution. Revolution would be started only when the ideas of socialism and revolution had gained popularity and then the masses would make the revolution. Only the youth had the intelligence, the sensibility, the freedom from domestic worries and a sense of sacrifice and heroism to perform the former task. Moreover, the youth alone could sacrifice their lives and thereby do "propaganda by deed" or through terrorist or other heroic actions.

Bipan Chandra points out that the great success of the revolutionary terrorists was in arousing the anti-imperialist consciousness. They succeeded in arousing the country and winning the love and respect of their countrymen, but for the cause of nationalism. The fruits of their success were gathered by the traditional Congress leadership which they had denounced as bourgeois and middle class and which they had hoped to replace, but which was actually and actively heading the anti-imperialist struggle. While nearly 90 percent of the revolutionary terrorists later gave their allegiance to Marxism or Commnuism, their deeds and slogans became the inheritance of Congressmen wedded to Gandhian leadership.

The revolutionary terrorists were active in Bengal in 1932-33. A few unpopular officers were assassinated. Sir Stanley Jackson, the Governor of Bengal, was shot at the Calcutta University Convocation by Bina Das who was sentenced to life imprisonment. At Chittagong, an armed uprising was attempted by the local youth led by Surya Sen, a terrorist leader. A comprehensive plan was prepared to launch simultaneous attacks on the Government armouries at Chittagong, Mymensing and Barisal. Surya Sen issued a manifesto in the name of the Indian Republican Army and called upon the Indians to rise in war against the British. Surya Sen and his associates mobilised local college and school students who included young girls like Kalpana Dutt and Pritilata Wadedar and young boys like Ananda Gupta and Tegra Bal. The revolutionaries planned to send our batches to capture the Police Armoury and Auxiliary Force and to destroy telephone exchange and telegraph office. The Police Armoury was raided by 50 youths disguised in British Indian army uniforms, but in a hurry the raiders failed to take cartridges for the Lewis guns and rifles which they had captured. The result was that a small police force under the Deputy Inspector General of Police forced them to retreat from the town into the hills. On 22 May 1932, 57 revolutionaries were surrounded by a British regiment but many of them escaped to carry on guerilla warfare. Later, a number of revolutionaries were either killed or arrested. Surya Sen was betrayed and was arrested and hanged. Kalpna Dutt was arrested and Tegra Bal died fighting. Pritilata Wadedar took potassium cyanide and died.

In August 1932, Benoy Bose shot at and killed a senior British officer and then escaped. In December 1932, he shot down the Inspector General of Prisons in his office and instead of being captured, he shot himself.

The leader of the Yugantar Party in Calcutta drew up a programme of terrorism and made arrangements for the manufacture of bombs. The principal features of that programme were the murder of Europeans in hotels, clubs and cinemas simultaneously in Calcutta and other districts by bombs, the burning of the aerodrome at Dum Dum with petrol, the cutting off of the gas and electric supply of Calcutta by destroying gas works and electric power stations, the cutting off of the petrol supply of Calcutta by destroying the depots at Budge-Budge, the disorganisation of the tramway service in Calcutta by cutting off over-head wires, the destruction of telephonic communication between Calcutta and the districts in Bengal and the destruction of bridges and railway lines by dynamites and hand-grenades. However, nothing much was done in the direction of harming Government institutions as that required careful organisation, skill, secrecy and capital.

Chandrasekhar Azad was a fearless person who was ready to sacrifice anything for the freedom of his country. He had a hand in the Kakori conspiracy case. He helped Bhagat Singh in his attack on Saunders. He and Yash Pal chalked out a plan to blow up the train in which Lord Irwin, the Viceroy of India was travelling. When on 23 December, 1929, the train left the Nizamuddin Railway Station near New Delhi, a bomb exploded and the train was derailed. However, Lord Irwin escaped unhurt. On 27 February, 1931, Azad was surrounded by the armed police in the Alfred Park at Allahabad. He fought bravely with revolvers in his both hands. His body was punctured with bullets. While he used the other bullets on the police, the last bullet he used on himself and thus died a martyr in the cause of India's freedom.

Yash Pal was selected Commander-in-Chief of the Hindustan Socialist Republican Army after the death of Azad. He re-organised the revolutionary army and made a declaration of a general revolt. He was caught, tried and sentenced to fourteen years' rigorous imprisonment.

On 22 July, 1931, an attempt was made on the life of Sir Evest Hoston, the Acting Governor of Bombay, when he was on his visit to the Fergusson College, Poona, but he had a miraculous escape as the bullet struck a metal button on his pocket book.

As the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, Sir Michael O' Dwyer was responsible for the various atrocities committed on the people of the Punjab. Udham Singh, a revolutionary, went to London in 1919 and waited for full 20 years to have revenge against Sir Michael. On 13 March, 1940 when Sir Michael was leaving the Caxton Hall, London, Udham Singh fired at him and killed him with his second bullet. He was tried, convicted, sentenced to death and hanged.

It is worthy of notice that the revolutionary terrorists had to work under many handicaps. Their work was such that complete secrecy had to be maintained and hence the participants did not even know the real names of one another. In many cases, that led to suspicion and lack of confidence and bickerings among the members. Some of the revolutionaries did not appreciate the importance of secrecy and divulged some of the secrets in their gossip. The result was that the secret service of the British Government was able to pick up the clues and thereby traced out the

revolutionaries and captured them. Even their secret plans thus failed. The Government was able to seize and confiscate arms and ammunition and money sent by their comrades and foreign sympathizers. While the people admired their sacrifices and sympathized with their sufferings, they were not inspired by their ideology. The result was that the revolutionary terrorists did not get support from the masses and were caught by the police. They did not realise that without the active cooperation of the masses and the classes, no single individual or group could free the people from foreign yoke. Most of the revolutionary terrorists of Bengal were Bhadraloks. Socially and economically, they belonged to the semi-feudal middle classes and depended upon the Zamindari system. The revolutionary terrorist movement in Bengal was confined to the Hindus alone and did not appeal to the imagination of the Muslims as their interests clashed with them. The differences between the revolutionaries and the constitutionalists also weakened the position of the revolutinoary terrorists. Both of them could have worked together in their respective fields without interfering with each other.

The revolutionary terrorism became almost a dying force after 1934-35. As a group activity, it disappeared almost completely. During the last days of the movement, many revolutionaries got convinced that purely terrorist methods could not bring about Independence of their country. That does not mean that the revolutionaries were converted to the Gandhian technique of non-violence. They simply stopped thinking in terms of terrorism. The emergence of Mahatma Gandhi as the undisputed leader of the Independence movement led to the gradual decline of revolutionary terrorist activity. However, the revolutinary terrorists played their part during the Revolt of 1942, the Mutiny of the Royal Indian Navy and the work of the Indian National Army (Azad Hind Fauz) of Subhas Chandra Bose.

It is true that the revolutionary terrorists failed to bring about the independence of India, but they had made their own contribution to the national cause. By sacrificing their own lives, they set an example before the people of India. They taught them by personal example and not by precept. By their sacrifices, they created a new spirit which helped the people of India to win their freedom later on. Their desperate deeds, daring plans, cool action and indifference to death won for them a lasting place in the memory of the nation.

From the point of view of pure academic thinking in political and social field, the contribution of the revolutionaries was not much. They were not scholars. They were young men with a zeal to liberate their country. They left behind their heroic deeds and not any scholarly writings. However, some of them have left behind inspired biographies, messages and manifestoes which contain good material for students of political science.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Bhagwati Charan : *The Story of the Revolutionary Movement.*
Bhagwati Charan : *The Philosophy of the Bomb.*
Bipan Chandra : *Nationalism and Colonialism in Modern India*, New Delhi, 1981.

Bose, A.C. : *Indian Revolutionaries Abroad* (1905-1922), Patna, 1971.

Bose, Subhas Chandra : *The Indian Struggle.*

Chatterji, J.C. : *Indian Revolutionaries in Conference*, Calcutta, 1960.

Chatterji, J.C. : *In Search of Freedom*, Calcutta, 1967

Chaturvedi, Banarsi Das (Ed.) : *Ram Prasad Bismil*, Delhi, 1958.

Deol, D.S. : *The Role of the Ghadar Party in the National Movement.*

Dharam Vira : *Lala Hardayal and Revolutionary Movements of his Times*, New Delhi, 1970.

Guha, Arun Chandra : *First Spark of Revolution : The Early Phase of India's Struggle for Independence* (1900-1920), Orient Longmans, 1971.

Gupta, Manmathnath : *History of the Indian Revolutionary Movement*, Bombay, 1972.

Gupta, Manmathnath : *They Lived Dangerously*, New Delhi, 1969.

Hardas, Balashastri : *Armed Struggle for Freedom*, Poona, 1958.

Hutchison, Lister : *Conspiracy at Meerut*, London, 1935.

Hutchison, Lister : *Meerut Trial* (1929-37).

Joshi, V.S. : *Vasudeo Balwant Phadke*, Bombay, 1959.

Keer, Dhananjay : *Savarkar and His Times*, Bombay, 1950.

Khushwant Singh and Satindra Singh : *Ghadar* 1915. *India's First Armed Revolution*, New Delhi, 1967.

Majumdar, R.C. : *Struggle for Freedom.*

Mathur, L.P. : *Indian Revolutionary Movement in the United States of America*, New Delhi, 1970.

Mukherjee, Uma : *Two Great Indian Revolutionaries : Rash Behari Bose and Jyotindra Nath Mukherjee*, Calcutta, 1966.

Sandhu, Virendra : *Yugadrashta Bhagat Singh*, Delhi, 1968.

Sharma, Ramprakash : *Khudiram.*

Tegart, C.A. : *Terrorism in India*, London, 1932.

Thakur, Gopal : *Bhagat Singh : The Man and His Ideas*, New Delhi, 1952.

Vaishampayan, Vishwanath : *Amar Shahid Chandrashekhar Azad*, Banaras, 1967.

Vajnik, Indulal : *Shyamaji Krishnavarma : Life and Times of an Indian Revolutionary*, Bombay, 1950.

CHAPTER XX

Muslim Political Thought

Sir Syed Ahmad Khan (1817-1898)

While studying Muslim political thought in modern India, the name of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan comes first. He was the pioneer in the advancement of modern learning in the Muslim community and a great promoter of enlightenment. He was the child of English liberalism and the father of Muslim communalism in India.

He was born on 17 October, 1817 and died on 28 March, 1898. Both from the side of his father and mother, he belonged to aristocratic Muslim families. In 1839, he joined as a petty judicial officer under the English East India Company. From 1846 to 1854, he worked in Delhi courts. In 1857, he was in Bijnor and had risen to the rank of Sadr Amin. During the Revolt of 1857, he remained faithful to the British Government. He pleaded with the British to forgive his co-religionists and worked hard to bring about a change of heart in the British towards the Muslims.

He wrote a booklet entitled "The Causes of the Indian Revolt." He tried to disprove that the Revolt was preceded by a widespread conspiracy or help which came from any foreign power such as Russia or Persia. He attacked the Mughal Emperor. His contention was that "there was not one of the great landed princes who espoused the rebel cause". Again, "The rebels were mostly men of the lower classes. To cite any contradiction of what I say, the cases of the Nawab of Jhujjar and the Raja of Bulubhgarh and other such petty feudations would show little else than ignorance of the status of the various Hindustani chiefs." He maintained that "the late Disturbance" was not a religious war for the Muslims.

After analysing the various causes of the Revolt of 1857, Syed Ahmad Khan maintained that it was the outcome of the non-admission of the natives of India to the Legislative Council. To quote him, "Because of this great administrative blunder, all men looked upon the British Government as slow poison, a rope of sand, a treacherous flame of fire. There was no man to reason with them, no one to point out the absurdity of such ideas". Again, "I believe that this rebellion owes its origin to one great cause to which all others are secondary branches, so to speak, the parent stem". His view was that it was highly conducive to the welfare, prosperity and stability of the Government that the people should have a voice. It is from the voice of the people only that a Government can learn whether its projects are likely to be well received or not. Syed Ahmad Khan advocated the association of all Indians in the Councils of the Government through their chosen representatives and also in the administration of District and local boards through their elected members. He emphasized the fact that the basic and fundamental cause of the revolt of 1857 was the neglect of the association of Indians in the Councils of the Government.

Syed Ahmad Khan also busied himself in writing a series of pamphlets called "The Loyal Muhammadans of India". He did not try to excuse "those Muhammadans who behaved undutifully and joined in the rebellion; on the contrary, I hold their conduct in utter abhorrence as being in the highest degree criminal." He also condemned the "wholesale denunciation against Muhammadans as a race in which newspapers are won't to indulge and which stains the pages of those who have written upon the events of 1857."

Syed Ahmad Khan founded the translation society at Ghazipur in order to bring European literary treasures within reach of the non-English knowing Indians. The name of the society was changed to Scientific Society after his transfer to Aligarh. On 30 March, 1866, the Aligarh Institute Gazette was started. The Society translated into Urdu and published many important European works on politics and economics. On 10 May, 1866, he impressed upon the members of his audience the necessity of bringing Indian affairs more prominently before the Parliament. He wanted to make known to the British Parliament "the requirements and wishes of that portion of mankind on whose behalf they are to exert themselves. He wanted the Muslims to be loyal to the British rulers. He spoke out openly, honestly and with due respect all their grievances, hopes and fears and assured them that that was compatible with true loylty to the state.

In 1870, Syed Ahmad Khan retired from Government service. On 24 May, 1875 he started a school at Aligarh which was turned into the Mohammadan Anglo-Oriental College in 1877. This College was established at Aligarh to provide a centre of Western learning for the Muslims of the higher classes so that they hight recover the ground lost as a result of the opposition of the Ulama to Western education, to show to the British rulers that Islam was not anti-pathetic to the West in culture, religion and social relations, to promote loyalty towards the rulers and solicit their favours and to teach the Muslims that Islam was not a stereo-typed static religion but a progressive and liberal religion in consonance with reason and the laws of nature.

Syed Ahmad Khan published a magazine in Urdu called "The Improvement of Manners and Morals" (Tahzib-ul-Akhlaq) devoted mainly to social and religious problems. His immediate aim was to assimilate the best in Western life and thought into Indo-Muslim culture. He gave a new interpretation to Islam. He criticised those beliefs and opinions which had no basis in the scriptures and yet had become a part and parcel of Muslim belief or practice. He tried to explain the Quran and the traditions of the Prophet in the light of contemporary scientific knowledge. In the field of politics, he was a firm believer in the need for cooperation between the Muslim community and the British Government.

From 1878 to 1882, he was a Member of the Viceroy's Council. In 1886, he laid the foundations of the Annual Muslim Educational Conference. That Conference became a centre of information regarding the general and educational condition of the Muslims of India. It also became a forum for the dissemination of Muslim political opinions. In 1888, he founded the Indian Patriotic Association. It was opposed to the Congress organisation and wanted to remove those bad feelings from the hearts of the Indian people which the supporters of the Congress were stirring up throughout

the country. Lord Dufferin appointed him a Member of the Public Service Commission. In 1889, he was decorated with the title of K.C.S.I. Favours were showered on him by the British Government. In 1893, he started the Muhammadan Defence Association of Upper India whose object was to prevent the Muslims from joining the Congress. When he visited England, he was welcomed everywhere as a friend of the British Government. He died on 28 March, 1898.

As a Nationalist

Sir Syed started his life as a Liberal. His speeches showed that he was a patriotic Indian. He was a religious and social reformer and a firm believer in the idea of Indian nationalism and Hindu-Muslim unity. His thinking was very much like the Moderates among the Hindus. He believed that an interpretation of Muslim religion was imperative in order to meet the challenge of modern science and Western thought. He tried to interpret Islam in the light of science and rationality. He tried to prove that the teachings of the Quran were in accord with reason and laws of nature. He tried to modernise Islam. His views were that the teachings of the Quran were divinely inspired and eternal and therefore faultless and binding in both word and meaning. No deviation was permissible from them. The authority of the Hadith was obligatory only in matters of religion and was permissive in worldly affairs. The will of man was free. He did not accept the possibility of miracles as those were against the laws of nature. He believed that no one who believed in God can be condemned as a Kafir or Infidel or heretic. He tried to change the character of slavery by advocating that the slaves be treated liberally. His view was that although polygamy was allowed in Islam, it was allowed only in very rare circumstances. He maintained that the idea of Jehad was not justified against the non-Muslims except when Islam was attacked. He contended that every type of interest was not prohibited in Islam. He maintained that the institution of the Caliphate ended with Imam Hassan and therefore the Sultan of Turkey had no justification to claim the title of Caliph. In this way, Syed Ahmad Khan tried to liberalise Islam and he made it possible for the Muslims to cooperate and collaborate with other communities in India.

During the earlier period of his life, Syed Ahmad Khan played the same role among the Muslims of India as was done by Raja Rammohan Roy among the Hindus. Both of them were liberals and socio-religious reformers. Both of them tried to re-interpret their religion and justify them on the ground of reason and natural law. Both of them believed in the oneness of God and equality of man. Both of them stood for social and religious reforms. Both of them advocated the introduction of Western education in India. Both of them admired the British rule in India and asked the Indians to be loyal. Both of them believed in Hindu-Muslim unity. Both of them believed in the composite character of Indian culture.

Syed Ahmad Khan believed in a common Indian nationality and was willing to make concessions for the sake of Hindu cooperation. He suggested to the Muslims that they should give up cow slaughter if that could establish friendly relations with the Hindus.

In his speech delivered at Patna on 27 January, 1883, Syed Ahmad Khan observed, "Just as the high caste Hindus came and settled down in this

land once and forgot where their earlier home was and considered India to be their own country, the earlier Muslims also exactly did the same thing. They also left their climes hundreds of years ago and they also regard this land of India as their own.. Both my Hindu brethren and my Muslim co-religionists breathe the same air, drink the water of sacred Ganga and Jamuna, eat the product of the earth which God has given to this country, live and die together....I say with conviction that if we were to disregard for a moment our conception of Godhood, then in all matters of everyday life, the Hindus and Mulims really belong to one nation (Qaum) and the progress of the country is possible only if we have the union of hearts, mutual sympathy and love. I have always said that our land of India is like a newly wedded bride whose two beautiful and luscious eyes are the Hindus and the Musalmans; if the two exist in mutual concord, the bride will remain for ever resplendent and becoming, while if they make up their mind to see in different directions, the bride is bound to become squinted and even partially blind." In the same speech, Syed Ahmad Khan said, "After long dwelling in India, our blood has changed its original colour. Now the colour of our skin is the same; our features are alike. We, the Muslims and the Hindus, have exchanged many of our social customs. We have merged so much into each other that we have produced a new language—Urdu—which was the language of neither of us."

In a speech made at Gurdaspur on 27 January, 1884, Syed Ahmad Khan re-affirmed his faith in the unity of the Hindus and Muslims. To quote him, "We should try to become one heart, and soul and act in unison; if united, we can support each other. If not, the effect of one against the other would tend to the destruction and downfall of both." Again, "Hindu and Mohammadan brethren, do you people any country other than Hindustan ? Do you not inhabit the same land ? Are you not burned and buried on the same soil ? Do you not tread the same ground and live upon the same soil ? Remember that the words Hindu and Mohammadan are only meant for religious distinction; otherwise all persons, whether Hindu or Mohammadan, even the Christians who reside in this country, are all in this particular respect of one and the same nation. Then all these different sects can only be described as one nation; they must each and all unite for the good of the country which is common to all."

While replying to an address presented to him by the Arya Samaj, Syed Ahmad Khan said, "You have used the term Hindus for yourself. This is not correct. For, in my opinion, the word Hindu does not denote a particular religion, but on the contrary every one who lives in India has the right to call himself a Hindu. I am, therefore, sorry that although I live in India, you do not consider me a Hindu."

On account of his utterances, Syed Ahmad Khan was regarded a leader of both the Hindus and Muslims. When he went to the Punjab in 1884 to collect funds for the M.A.O. College at Aligarh, a large number of addresses were presented to him both by the Hindus and the Muslims in which he was praised for his services to the nation. In his reply, he asked both the Hindus and the Muslims to forge a united front in order to evolve a composite nationhood representing the sentiments of every community in India.

During this very phase of his career, Syed Ahmad Khan supported the

Ilbert Bill which tried to remove the discrimination against the authority of Indian judges. In 1884, he organised a public meeting for Surendranath Banerjea to speak about simultaneous competitive examinations for the Indian Civil Service in England and in India and himself presided over the meeting. He described the Bengali Hindu intellectuals as the vanguard of the national liberal movement. In his reply to the address presented to him by the Indian Association at Lahore in 1884, Syed Ahmad Khan observed, "I confess that the Bengali are the only people in our country of whom we can rightly feel proud. It is solely on account of them that learning and liberty have flourished and the feeling of patriotism has spread in our country. I can rightly say that they are certainly the cream of the whole people (Qaum) of India." It is clear from above that during this phase of his career before 1885, Syed Ahmad Khan was a champion of Indian nationalism. His concept of nation included all communities irrespective of their faiths.

As a Communalist

It appears that the whole attitude of Syed Ahmad Khan changed after the establishment of the Indian National Congress in 1885. He lost no opportunity to condemn the Indian National Congress and called upon the Muslims of India not to join it. He did his level best to dissuade Badruddin Tyabji from presiding over the third session of the Indian National Congress held in Madras in 1887. This is what he wrote to him, "I do not understand what the words National Congress mean. Is it supposed that the different castes and creeds living in India belong to one nation or can become a nation and their aims and aspirations be one and the same? I think it is quite impossible, and when it is quite impossible, there can be no such thing as a National Congress, nor can it be of equal benefits to all people. I object to every Congress in any shape or form whatever which regards India as one nation." He opposed the Congress proposal to hold simultaneous competitive examinations for the Indian Civil Service, although on an earlier occasion he had supported this demand. He suggested selection by the Government as an alternative to competitive examination. He opposed the system of representation on the ground that it was not suitable to India. His contention was that the Hindus and Muslims were two different nations in spite of the fact that they drink from the same well, breathe the air from the same city and depend each on the other for his life. He pointed out that if the British, with all their armed forces and ammunition, were to withdraw from India, the two nations—the Mussalmans and the Hindus —could not sit on the same throne and remain equal in power. It was necessary that one of them should conquer the other and thrust it down. To hope that both could remain equal in power was to wish for the impossible and the inconceivable.

In support of his contention that representative institutions were unsuited to the conditions in India, Syed Ahmad Khan gave he following example:—

"Let us suppose that we had universal suffrage as in America and everybody, from the highest to lowest, was given the franchise. What would happen then? The Muslim voters would vote for the Muslim candidates and the Hindu voters would vote for the Hindu candidates with the result

that the Hindu candidates would have four times as many votes as the Muslim candidates because their population was four times as numerous. How then could the Muslim in such a situation safeguard his interest? It would be like a game of dice in which one man had four dice and the other one."

Syed Ahmad Khan also maintained that the Indian Muslims must depend on the British to safeguard their interests and their effective representation in administration. He asked the Muslims to unite with the British because according to the Quran, "Our nation cannot expect friendship and affection from any other people".

Syed Ahmad Khan maintained that the real object of the Congress was that the Government of India should be English in name only and the internal rule of the country should be entirely in the hands of the Congressmen. According to Sir Syed, the Congress movement was nothing short of a civil war, but a civil war without arms. "Let there be transference of power; the Muslims were not afraid. Let there be competitive examinations, the Muslims were not worried. But in this competition we should be allowed to use the pen of our ancestors which is in truth the true pen for writing the decrees of sovereignty".

Sir Syed maintained that representative Government was not suited to India because she did not constitute a homogeneous nation. The Indians spoke different languages, professed different faiths, had different cultures, belonged to different races, believed in different customs and were brought up in different historical traditions.

In 1886, Sir Syed laid the foundations of the Annual Muslim Educational Conference. With the help of the Muslim Conference, the Muslims hoped to cover "the whole of Upper India with a network of societies, committees and individuals, all working harmoniously for the great cause so that a big evil may be dealt with by a strong remedy and by the vigorous work of one generation the tide of misfortune may be turned and the Mohammadan nation may be set moving on the tide of progress abreast of all the other nations of India". In 1888, Sir Syed founded the Indian Patriotic Association to oppose the Congress. In 1893, he started the Mohammadan Defence Association of Upper India with a view to prevent the Muslims from joining the Congress. Principal Beck wrote, "The object of the Congress is to transfer the political control of the country from the British to the Hindus. Muslims can have no sympathy with these demands. It is imperative for the Muslims and the British to unite with a view to fightinig these agitators and prevent the introduction of democratic form of Government unsuited to the needs and genius of the country. We, therefore, advocate loyalty to the Government and Anglo-Muslim collaboration".

In a speech at Meerut on 16 March 1888, Sir Syed maintained that the Hindus and Muslims are not only two nations, but also two warring nations who could never lead a common political life if the British left India.

Reasons for Change in his attitude

Many reasons have been put forward for the change in the attitude of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. One reason given is the British policy of divide

and rule in the country. The British Government knew that if the Indian National Congress was allowed to grow unchecked, there was every possibility of its becoming a great force and ultimately the British Government would be forced to make India free. The one way out of the difficulty was to weaken the nationalist movement by keeping the Muslims away from it. The British found that Syed Ahmad Khan was a leader of both the Hindus and the Muslims and they won him over by various inducements. Principal Beck of the Aligarh College also played his part in weaning Syed Ahmad Khan from the nationalist movement. He convinced him that Anglo-Muslim alliance alone could help the Muslims to improve their position and not an alliance with the Indian National Congress where they would be reduced to a minority. The British showered honours on Syed Ahmad Khan. He was welcomed everywhere. The result was that Syed Ahmad Khan was completely won over and he came to believe that the only way for the Muslims to progress was to keep away from the Congress and to support the Government against the Congress.

Syed Ahmad Khan aimed at raising Muslim intelligentsia to a higher and better status. This was possible only with British support because the Hindus were more advanced in the field of education and the Muslims could not compete with them on equal terms. The result was that Syed Ahmad Khan supported the Government against the Congress.

It is contended that it was the short-sighted policy of the Congress leadership which was responsible for the alienation of Syed Ahmad Khan. It is maintained that Syed Ahmad Khan wanted to become the President of the Congress in 1887 but no efforts were made by the Congress leaders to come to a settlement with him. As he got disillusioned with the Congress, he hastened to fall in the camp of the British Govrenment. This is what Syed Ahmad Khan said on 28 December, 1887 in a speech at the All-India Muslim Educational Conference held at Lucknow: "When our Hindu brethren or Bengali friends wish to make a move which involves a loss to us and humiliation to our community, we cannot remain friendly and undoubtedly it is our duty to protect our community from those attacks of the Hindus and Bengalis which we are sure are going to harm our community".

The view of Hali is that the change in Syed Ahmad Khan took place on account of Hindu agitation against Urdu which was not liked by him as he had great love and admiration for Urdu. The view of Sir Syed was that Urdu was neither the language of the Hindus nor of the Muslims. It was a language that had its source in Hindu-Muslim cooperation. It was the result of the joint endeavour of both the communities. Sir Syed regarded Urdu as the symbol of Hindu-Muslim cooperation and unity. Once that symbol was attacked, Sir Syed felt hurt and enraged.

Another view is that Sir Syed was basically against the very idea of democracy and parliamentary form of Government. When the Congress started, Sir Syed realised that through the Congress, the Hindus would be asking for a democratic form of Government, individual liberty and equality. Sir Syed suffered from a sense of racial superiority. He was conscious of the fact that the Muslims had ruled over the Hindus for centuries and the very idea of equality between Hindus and Muslims was not liked by him. He put emphasis on the fundamental differences between the Hindus

and the Muslims. The Hindus were the ruled and the Muslims were the rulers. Even in his time, the Hindus were in a majority and the Muslims were in a minority. The level of modernisation among the two communities was different. The main support of the Indian National Congress was the English educated middle classes of India. Sir Syed felt that there was no middle class among the Muslims and hence there was no meeting ground between the Hindus and the Muslims. Sir Syed was an elitist in his attitude and temperament. He had contempt for the mob. He joined the Government to safeguard the interests of the Muslims. He denounced both the Congress and the Hindu community.

Other Views of Sir Syed

Sir Syed was influenced by the Wahabi movement in India which was both revivalist and terrorist in character. He was primarily a Wahabi but his Wahabism was confronted with the new realities of the situation. His conclusion was that the movement could be neither anti-British nor anti-Sikh. According to him, the aim of Wahabism was not to establish an Islamic Government but to secure religious liberty for the Muslims. He also believed that so long as the British did not interfere in the religious affairs of the Muslims, the Muslims should obey the existing Government. That was in conformity with the teachings of Islam. His interpretation of religion was rational and undogmatic. He believed that there was no antagonism between Islam and reason and science. He was inspired by the writings of Lord Macaulay, J. S. Mill and Bentham. He was also impressed by the reformist movements among the Hindus led by Rammohan Roy. Sir Syed was a staunch Muslim. He was critical of traditional philosophical and religious thought. He was also opposed to the leadership of the Ulama in society. He was in favour of reconciliation between the interests of the ruler and the ruled. He believed in the justice and fairplay of the British.

Sir Syed had great regard for the dignity of the individual. According to him, there were two types of Government, civilised and uncivilised. A good Government had nothing to do with religion. Genuine religion was not concerned with daily affairs. The main purpose of religion is spiritual reform. A good Government should not interfere in the religious life of the people. The people were not required to accept the religious belief of the ruler. Sir Syed advised the Indians to give up their idea of rising against the British. The British connection was Providential and would last for ever. A smooth working of the institutions of the Government was essential and they should function independently.

Nation and Nationalism

Sir Syed used the term "nation" to denote the people. All Indians constitute one single nation. He used the word Hindu in a broad sense. He who was living in India was a Hindu. In this sense, Sir Syed was the prophet of Hindu-Muslim unity. However, later on he changed his views and described the Muslims as a separate nation.

Sir Syed believed that due to their educational backwardness, the Muslims lacked sufficient political consciousness. They should not support the Congress as there was no sound middle class among them. The Congress was not a mass organisation but a representative of the interests of the

middle class. His view was that the Congress was harmful for the Hindus also.

Sir Syed had no passion for the Pan-Islamic movement of Jamal-ud-din Afghani. He had no faith in the validity of the institution of Khilafat. He wanted to nationalise Khilafat and subject it to checks. He was afraid of the growth of Pan-Islamism because he thought it would give an impetus to the leadership of the orthodox Ulama.

Maulana Muhammad Ali (1879-1931)

If Dr. Iqbal was the philosopher of the new awakening among the Muslims of India, Maulana Muhammad Ali was its man of action. To Muslim political life, he contributed an important asset called mass support. When M. A. Jinnah launched his campaign for Pakistan, it was the support given to him by the Muslim masses which brought success as well as the help of trained workers who had received their political training under Muhammad Ali during the Khilafat movement.

Muhammad Ali was born in 1879 at Rampur (in U.P.). He died on 3 January 1931. He studied at Aligarh and Oxford. He came back to India in 1902 and served the states of Rampur and Baroda. He gave up his job and joined politics. In 1911, he started the Comrade whose first issue came out on 11 January, 1911. He was one of the original members of the All-India Muslim League. It was through his efforts that M. A. Jinnah was persuaded to join the Muslim League in 1913.

Muhammad Ali was an ardent Muslim. His loyalty was not limited to Islam in India. The difficulties of the Muslims in any part of the world elicited his sympathy and active concern. He was a true representative of the ideals of Islam and the feelings of the Muslims in India. When the World War I came, Muhammad Ali wanted Turkey to join the Allies but that did not happen. Muhammad Ali wrote an article on 16 September, 1914 which was proscribed by the Government. Muhammad Ali was interned in May 1915 for 5 years and was released on 25 December, 1919.

After his release, he attended the Indian National Congress at Amritsar. He went to Europe on a Khilafat deputation. He was the leading figure in the Khilafat movement. In 1921, he founded the Jama Millia Islamia at New Delhi. He collaborated with Mahatma Gandhi and accepted his leadership of the Khilafat moevement. He asked the Muslims not to serve in the army so long as the British Government did not redress the wrongs done to Turkey. He was prosecuted and convicted. In his address to the Jury, he declared, "I say God before everything—God before loyalty, God before King, God before patriotism, God before my country, God before my father, mother and child." He was convicted and sentenced to two years' imprisonment and released in August 1923. He was the President of the Indian National Congress at its annual session held at Coconada in 1923.

Differences arose between Mahatma Gandhi and Muhammad Ali. Muhammad Ali became a communalist. He became the champion of the rights and interests of the Muslims and subordinated everything to it. He attended the first Round Table Conference held in London in 1930-31. While addressing the Conference, he declared that he will not go back to his country unless freedom was given to her. He died on 3 January, 1931

in London and was buried in Jerusalem at the request of the Muslims in Palestine.

Muhammad Ali had a religious approach to life and politics. He had full faith in God and the Quran. He was a fearless and emotional man. Whatever he did, he put his whole heart and soul into it. That was true of him both as the leader of the Khilafat movement and as a Congressman.

He was inspired by the Aligarh movement and was also its product. He was fully aware of the importance of the work done by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. His view was that the Aligarh movement was in the interests of the Indian Muslims as the Western educated Muslims did not have any respect for tradition and religion. They also lacked the genuine spirit of enquiry and search for truth. Hence, the British system of education did not suit the genius of the people of India. It produced men who were more communal than religious. However, he did not question the necessity or deny the influence of English education.

He acknowledged Tilak as his political Guru. Like Tilak, he believed in providing a popular basis to the nationalist moevement in the country. Both of them aimed at the goal of self-Government. Both of them criticised the methods employed by the Moderates in the Congress. On account of the influence of Tilak, Muhammad Ali realised the necessity and significance of mass contact among the Muslims. Both of them used religion to provide a mass base to Indian politics.

Muhammad Ali believed in the basic teachings of Islam and had no hesitation in joining the Non-cooperation movement started by Gandhiji. Although Mahatma Gandhi exercised some influence on Muhammad Ali, he was conscious of "communal individuality".

Muhammad Ali was not prepared to accept anything that was in conflict with Islam. Islam was not a bundle of dogmas and doctrines. It was a complete scheme of life, a perfect code of right conduct and a comprehensive social polity as wide as the human race. He believed that religion was not a ritual. It was an interpretation of life, a complete culture and a polity. He had his religion always in his mind. He was not prepared to accept that all religions were as true and sound as Islam. To him, Islam was the eternal truth. Islam was unchanging and had remained unchanged for the last more than 13 centuries.

The interpretation of Islam by Muhammad Ali was not liberal. He tried to defend every aspect of Islam. His religiosity vitiated his political philosophy and made it anti-secular. His view was that secularism could limit the range of Islam and render it ineffective in non-spiritual matters. It was against the spirit and injunctions of the Quran and the sayings of the Prophet. According to him, there was compulsion not in religion but of religion. Secularism was a Western idea which could not be applied in the East. He was not prepared to give up the idea of Divine Government. The social and political ideas were conditioned by his orthodoxy. His approach was traditional and religion-oriented. That logically led to Pan-Islamism, aggressive Muslim nationalism and rejection of democracy.

Pan-Islamism

Muhammad Ali is considered to be the initiator of Pan-Islamism in India and there is truth in it. The basis of Pan-Islamism is one God, one

Prophet, one Kaba and one book, the Quran. Pan-Islam is not an institution but it has always been an abstract and emotional factor and not a pragmatic concept. It was not motivated by hatred against the non-Muslims. Pan-Islamism and Islam are synonymous and neither is aggressive nor provocative.

Muhammad Ali advocated Pan-Islamism in the form of the Khilafat movement. His view was that the question of Khilafat lay at the root of Islamic polity. The Khilafat was the most essential institution of the Muslims throughout the world and "our sympathy with Turkey was not political or territorial but religious, for the sovereign of Turkey was the successor of the Prophet and the Commander of the Faithful". The Caliph was the viceregent of God.

Muhammad Ali exploited the question of Khilafat for propagating Pan-Islamism. He did not find any conflict between the Khilafat and the independence movement in India and advised the Muslims to fight for the freedom of India as "a slave India would be of scant help to the Turks and Khalifa." This led to Islamic nationalism. Both the Khilafat and Islamic nationalism were the logical result of Pan-Islamism in India.

Islamic Nationalism

Muhammad Ali was an important spokesman of Islamic nationalism. He tried to have a compromise between Pan-Islamism and Indian nationalism. To quote him, "Where God commands, I am a Muslim first and a Muslim second and a Muslim last and nothing but a Muslim. Where India is concerned, I am an Indian first, Indian second and Indian last—nothing but an Indian." Though the Indianism of Muhammad Ali was subordinated to his loyalty to Islam, he was a true Indian. He considered Western nationalism as undesirable and harmful on account of its secular character. According to him, Islamic theocracy was super-nationalist in character and opposed to secular nationalism which was the work of Satan and not of God. Nationalism and religion were poles apart. Nationalism without religion killed the sense of right and wrong. A true Muslim should turn away from that nationalism which has for its creed "My country, right or wrong". While nationalism demands worship of one's country, Islam recognises one sovereignty alone, the sovereignty of God, which is supreme and unconditional, indivisible and inalienable.

Muhammad Ali put more emphasis on Pan-Islamism than on nationalism in the country. The Khilafat movement could mobilise and awaken only the Muslims and not the Hindus also. The view of Muhammad Ali was that "communal temper must change and interest must grow identical before the Hindus and Muslims can be welded into a united nationality".

Means

Muhammad Ali was not bothered about the means to be employed in politics. His view was that even violent and unconstitutional means could be employed for achieving the end of Pan-Islamism and the Khilafat. The Muslims of India could seek the help of any Muslim power to invade India. Muhammad Ali supported the Non-cooperation movement as a proper means for achieving the independence of the country. Such a step was sanc-

tioned by the Quran. Sacrifices were required for the cause of religion and freedom.

To Muhammad Ali, nationalism implied the independence of the country as well as freedom for the communities from the fear of domination by one another and continuity and preservation of what is best in Muslim culture. In India, the nation could be the synthesis of various races and creeds on the political plane and to some extent on the social plane. Muhmmad Ali was always afraid of Hindu-oriented Indian nationalism which was upheld by communal patriots. Indian nationality could not be viewed as co-extensive with the Hindu-religion because it left out millions of different creeds. Muhammad Ali pleaded for communal representation and separate electorates because the Muslims became suspicious of Swaraj becoming a Hindu Raj in practice.

Muhammad Ali's ideas of nationalism and religion were interwoven. His concept of nationalism was so much tainted by Islam that ultimately it was difficult to separate the two. It is rightly said that Muhammad Ali contributed more to the idea of Pan-Islamism than national consciousness among the Muslims in India.

Muhammad Ali's idea of nationalism had its effect on the growth of Muslim politics in India. His nationalism was of an extremist type. The Indian Muslims were a part of an international community and had a feeling of loyalty to the cause of Muslims all over the world. It is contended that although Islamic nationalism of Muhammad Ali may appear absurd, yet politically he played a positive role in creating a mass basis for Indian politics. The political ideas of Muhammad Ali were dominated by considerations of religion and loyalty to the Muslim community.

It is contended that the concept of nationalism of Muhammad Ali was a dangerous one. It could not offer a constructive solution to the problem of composite nationalism. Religion as the basis of nationalism would produce competitive nationalities and communal conflict in the country and would always act as a disruptive and destructive force. Muslim nationalism could not be separated from Pan-Islamism and in practice would means a Muslim Raj in India looking outward towards Muslims rather than towards fellow citizens of different faiths. Muhammad Ali failed to reconcile the cause of Islamic nationalism with a non-Islamic Government.

Democracy

The view of Muhammad Ali was that democracy as a form of Government was comparatively better than any other form of Government. According to him, the most important problem of a country was to determine its form of Government. In a democracy, there could be neither rapid decline nor rapid progress. Democracy is based on the liberty of all the people and is completely in keeping with human nature.

Muhammad Ali pointed out the conditions for the successful working of democracy in a country. According to him, the active cooperation of the people in public affairs is essential. If there is a genuine feeling of goodwill, it would evoke harmony in the political world and create a sense of generous and self-sacrificing patriotism. The minorities and the majority community must be bound together by the sentiment of healthy patriotism. The mino-

rity should feel that the patriotism of the majority community had ceased to be communal and exclusive. The ideal of self-Government demands supreme sacrifice from the people. According to him, the pride and egotism of race, the glory of self-assertion, the greed of selfishness and joy of racial battle were obstructions in the way of the successful working of democracy. Democracy required a system of education which was adapted to the life and genius of the people. The system of education should reflect the need of the people and should be managed democratically. The view of Muhammad Ali was that public opinion played an important part in the functioning of the Government but public opinion in India had not become a reality. Steps should be taken so that public opinion can find opportunities for effective expression. Muhammad Ali advocated the participation of women in public affairs. His view was that Islam was not opposed to it. He believed that women should not be confined to their houses.

Cultural Federalism

Muhammad Ali evolved the theory of cultural federalism or Federalism of Faiths. The basis of this theory is the principle of unity in diversity, the religious philosophy of oneness of God, tolerance, brotherhood, fraternity and adequate measures to ensure the preservation and growth of culture of various parts in the Indian nation. Muhammad Ali suggested a new synthesis in which there would be embodied a Federation of Faiths. Every section of the population of India would contribute "to territorial patriotism without abating a jot of the fervour of their extra-territorial sympathies."

According to Muhammad Ali, India could not become a composite state unless the principle of unity in diversity was accepted. Eventually India would be a cultural federation in which all cultural and religious minorities would enjoy a sense of security. If that was not done, India would remain a geographical misnomer. The only ultimate goal would be a union of faiths in India which would be "grander, nobler and infinitely more spiritual than the United States of America". Muhammad Ali knew that India was not a nation of homogeneous people but "a concord like that of Canada is not beyond the bounds of practicability." Muhammad Ali emphasized on the Muslims of India that India was their Motherland and their political loyalties ought to be centred on India and not outside.

Muhammad Ali was not a gifted philosopher. He had neither the mind nor the time for philosophical exercises. He was a great propagandist. He was essentially a revolutionary. His Western education and the influence of Islam moulded his ideas. His loyalty to Islam was unquestioned. His aim was the glorification of Islam. All his political activities were inspired by his love for Islam.

Muhammad Ali made his own contribution to Muslim politics. He synthesised the legacy of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan and Sibli. He was the first leader who consciously and successfully attempted to explore the possibilities of bringing together the Ulama and the Western educated youngmen. There was the unity of the Ulama and Western educated youth in the Khilafat movement. After the death of Muhammad Ali, the gulf between the Ulama and the educated youth widened.

It is contended that Muhammad Ali's view of Islam was largely unhis-

torical and unrealistic. He failed to understand the sociology of religion. He forgot that Islam was not only a creator of society but also a creation of society. He did not recognise that a change in the social system also requires a corresponding change in the religious outlook. His urge for independence of India was subservient to his passion for the supremacy of religion. He vacillated between Islam and nationalism, anti-imperialism and Pan-Islamism. He provided inspiration to both the nationalists and the separatists in India.

Dr. Mohammad Iqbal (1873-1938)

In the words of Dr. Moin Shakir, "The great watershed of Muslim political thought in modern India is Iqbal. He attempted to provide a systematic Islamic basis of the political ideas of the Indian Muslims." (Khilafat to Partition, p. 96). It is maintained that next to the Quran, there is no single influence upon the consciousness of Pakistani intelligentsia so powerful as the poetry of Dr. Iqbal. In his own time, it kindled the enthusiasm of Muslim intellectuals for the values of Islam and rallied the whole Muslim community to the banner of their faith. For this reason, Dr. Iqbal is looked upon as the spiritual founder of Pakistan.

Mohammad Iqbal was born at Sialkot (in the Punjab) on 22 February, 1873 and he died at Lahore on 21 April, 1938. He graduated from the Government College, Lahore in 1899 and was appointed a Lecturer in Philosophy. He worked in that capacity for six years. In 1905, he went to Europe for higher studies. He stayed there for three years and studied philosophy in Germany and at Cambridge. At Cambridge, he worked under MacTaggart. He submitted a thesis for Ph. D. on "The Development of Metaphysics in Iran". On his return to India in 1908, he resumed his post at the Government College, Lahore, and also started practising law. In 1911, he gave up teaching and devoted himself to poetry and practised law for his livelihood. Poetry became his main pre-occupation. His time was spent in studies and writing. In course of time, he was recognised as a great thinker and the greatest Urdu poet of his times.

Iqbal was knighted in 1922 in recognition of his greatness as a poet. He participated in the political activities of the Punjab and the Muslim community. In 1927, he was elected to the Punjab Legislative Assembly but he did not make a mark as a legislator. He gave evidence before the Simon Commission. He presided over the Allahabad session of the Muslim League in December 1930 where he presented his scheme for an autonomous Muslim region in the North-West of India as a solution of the communal problem facing the country. He attended the Second Round Table Conference held in London in 1931 as a Muslim delegate. He took an active part in the Muslim League politics and gave weighty support to the Muslim League in the preparations for elections under the Government of India Act, 1935. His crowning success was his conversion of M. A. Jinnah to his point of view on the question of re-distribution of Indian provinces on communal lines. He died on 21 April, 1938.

The greatest and the most powerful influence on the thought of Iqbal was that of the Quran. He believed that "the Quran teaches the most perfect religion which is a sure guide in the spiritual as well as the temporal affairs of man; the teachings of Islam are superior to the teachings of all

other religious systems; they are universal, eternal and unalterable." He was influenced by Nietzsche, William James, Henry Bergson and Dr. MacTaggart. The idea of the hierarchy of selves or egoes was borrowed from Liebnitz. The concept of perfectness was borrowed from Nietzche's concept of the Superman. The supernatural or mystical function of his idea of the ego was borrowed from Bergson. He was also influenced by the ideals of Jalal-ud-din Rumi. He tried to harmonise the dominant trends of Islamic theology and jurisprudence and the advances of human thought during the last centuries. Religion became the supreme consideration for Iqbal. Spiritualism superseded materialism and religion superseded science. He condemned the godlessness of Nietzsche and called Machiavelli a "messenger of Satan" because he separated ethics from politics. He considered Plato as the antithesis of Islam. He had preference for Aristotle but did not approve of his materialism.

The political thought of Iqbal is to be found in his poems and the addresses given by him from time to time at different places. Another source of information is his six lectures on the Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam which exist in a book form.

Iqbal as a Nationalist

The political ideas of Iqbal are in two phases viz., those prior to his going to Europe in 1905 and those after his return from Europe in 1908. Prior to his visit to Europe, Iqbal was an ardent nationalist. He admired India and wrote poems in the glory of India. His famous poem Taranah-i-Hind became almost Indian Anthem. In this poem, he praised India in the following words :—

> The best in the world is our Hindustan,
> We are her nightingales—She is our rose garden
> The lofty mountain that almost touches the sky,
> Is our guard and is our sentry.
> Religion doesn't teach us mutual hatred
> All are Indians—our home is Hindustan.

In another song entitled "Hindustani bachchon ka Qaumi geet", he said :—

> The country where Chishti delivered the message of truth,
> Where Nanak sang the song of unity,
> The country which Tartars made their home,
> Which allured the Arabs from Arabia,
> And made them leave their land,
> That country is my home—that is my home.

In another poem called Naya Shivala (New Temple) Iqbal described "each particle of the dust of his motherland as God." At that time, he talked of Indian unity and not of Muslim separatism. He even wrote on Rama and Swami Ramtirtha.

Iqbal as Communalist

There was a change in his views after his visit to Europe during 1905-8. He was no longer a nationalist. Instead of saying that "We are Indians and India is our home, he began to write "China, Arabia, and India

are ours". Again, "We are Muslims and the whole world is ours". His nationalism vanished. He became a strong advocate of Pan-Islamism and the Khilafat movement. He declared that Islam is not a nation but "a League of Nations". To quote him, "My real purpose is to look for a better social order and to present a universally acceptable ideal (of life and action) before the world, but it is impossible for me, in this effort, to outline this ideal, to ignore the social system and values of Islam whose most important objective is to demolish all the artificial and pernicious distinctions of caste, creed, colour and economic status. Islam has opposed vehemently the idea of racial superiority which is the greatest obstacle in the way of international unity and cooperation. This racial ideal is the greatest enemy of mankind and it is the duty of the well-wishers of the human race to eradicate it. When I realised that the conception of nationalism based on the differences of race and country, was beginning to over-shadow the world of Islam also and that the Muslims were in danger of giving up the universality of their ideal in favour of a narrow patriotism and false nationalism, I felt it my duty as a Muslim and as a well-wisher of humanity to recall them back to their true role in the drama of human evolution." Again, "No doubt, I am intensely devoted to Islam but I have selected the Islamic community as my starting point not because of any national or religious prejudice but because it is the most practical line of approach to the problem."

Iqbal chose the slogan, "Back to early Islam'. He put emphasis on the concept of Millat—the crystallization of Muslim fraternity. Kaba was to be its geographical centre. Love for God and allegiance to Prophet Muhammad was to fasten the bonds of Pan-Islamic union. The Divine law was to serve the guiding norm of the Millat. He ridiculed the League of Nations as a "lean structure of European diplomacy" which was to die at no distant future. He vehemently denounced the Congress as an organisation of the Hindus. He challenged its representative character and identified it with the native princes of India. He maintained that the Muslim League alone had the sole right to represent the Muslims of India. He asked the Muslims to keep away from the Congress and join the Muslim League. He challenged the secular character of the Indian National Congress.

Around 1912, Iqbal composed his famous poem Shikvah Aur Jawab-i Shikvah (Complaint and Answer) in which he said :

> Nation (Qaum) is created and sustained by religion;
> If religion expired, there will be no nation.

The publication of his long poem Asrar-i-Khudi brought him recognition as the poet of Islam par excellence. The address which Iqbal delivered at the annual session of the All-India Muslim League held at Allahabad in December 1930 as its President, became a landmark in Indian politics. This was perhaps the first time when an Indian Muslim publicly declared : "I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-Government within the British Empire or without the British Empire, and the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim state appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India".

When Dr. Iqbal thought of a separate homeland for the Muslims in 1930, it was primarily for the Muslims of the majority provinces. Later on, in

his letter dated 21 June, 1937 addressed to M. A. Jinnah, Dr. Iqbal wrote, "Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as nations entitled to self-determination just as other nations in India and outside India are? Personally I think the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal ought at present ignore Muslim minority provinces." The Presidential address of Dr. Iqbal to the Allahabad meeting of the Muslim League is important because on this occasion Iqbal demanded the establishment of an autonomous Muslim state in North-West India. He was addressing a group of politicians, not academicians and philosophers. He was to speak to them of Islamic ideals, but he was to do so with reference to the facts of Indian political life with which they must deal. He began by telling his audience that Islam, as an ethical ideal and as a politico-legal value system, had provided generations of Indian Muslims "those basic emotions and loyalties which generally unify scattered individuals and groups and finally transform them into well-defined people". Islam had functioned as a "people's building force" more effectively in India than anywhere else in the world. Laws and institutions associated with Islamic culture had given the Indian Muslim community a remarkable degree of inner unity and homogeneity. Its future as a "distinct cultural unit" would depend on the maintenance of that Islamic connection. The Muslims of India are far more homogeneous than any other group in the country. They were the only Indian people "who can fitly be described as a nation in the modern sense of the word". According to Iqbal, even the Hindus had not yet achieved the cohesion necessary for being a nation "which Islam has given them (the Muslims) as a free gift."

The view of Dr. Iqbal was that India was a land of many nations and her problems would not be resolved without the recognition that those problems were "international and not national". The personality of the Indian Muslims would be stifled if it fell under the dominance of a non-Muslim national personality and hence the demand for "Muslim India within India".

Muslim nationalism with Iqbal was the same as the unwillingness of the Muslim community to be ruled by a non-Muslim political power. Territorial, ethnic and linguistic appeals were to be rejected if they were addressed by a Non-Muslim group to a smaller Muslim group. Muslim nationalism was pre-eminently ideological in confrontational situations involving the non-Muslims. But where only a Muslim group was involved, territorial, ethnic and linguistic sympathies may be summoned in aid of ideology and to strengthen the inner cohesion of the group for survival and collective action. Where Muslims were politically dominant, Islam had no quarrel with modern territorial nationalism.

According to Iqbal, Islam and nationalism were rival principles for organising the ultimate political group. Nationalism brings people together. It also divides and keeps them divided. In its divisive aspect, nationalism generates pride in one's own group and low-regard for others. It legitimizes one group's imperialistic control and exploitation of another. It makes religion a private affair. It authorises rulers, majorities, Governments and dictators to usurp religion's regulatory jurisdiction in social interaction. It makes coercive power the ultimate author and arbiter of morals. The acceptance of such nationalism by a Muslim community entails a subversion of Islam.

The view of Iqbal was that action is life and inaction is death. The true meaning of human life lies in struggle with evil. Iqbal was convinced that Islam provided a remedy for many of the ills of the world. According to him, the division of humanity into national and racial groups was the greatest curse of the day. He hated colonialism, landlordism and capitalism. According to him, the real remedy lay in the cultivation of the innate greatness of human Self so that it became incapable of meaner tendencies like greed, injustice and fear. Such a development of the Self is possible only through a true understanding of the relationship between God and man. Even God does not demand the destruction of the Self. God desires that Self should be developed to its fullest capacity. The Self finds its fullest meaning only through identification with the life of the community. For that purpose, the community should be organised on a righteous basis. Such a community is the community of Islam because its sole foundation is the acceptance of God and Law which is the criterion of righteousness. Islam recognises no superiority of birth or rank or wealth and judges excellence by righteousness alone. The fullest cultivation of the Self is possible within Islam. The community of Islam is not limited by time or space. According to Islamic doctrine, all truth from God revealed anywhere at any time is Islam and Prophet Muhammad is the final recipient of that truth in its most perfect form. Such a community was not meant to be fragmented into nations. The means by which the Self can develop to its full height is Love which is Sufi word for ecstatic devotion to God. It is higher and everlasting. It is infinite and eternal. It is an attribute of God himself. Realising the importance of his message to the whole of the Islamic world, Iqbal began to write in Persian which is more widely understood and read in the Muslim world than Urdu.

Cause of Change in Iqbal's Views

The change in the views of Dr. Iqbal is attributed to his stay in Europe and the Indian political situation of his time. Western civilisation had two diametrically opposing effects on Iqbal. On the one hand, he was full of admiration for the scientific attitude of mind and the untiring energy of Western society. On the other hand, he hated the same society for its materialism. Dr. Iqbal was disillusioned by the West and he wanted to live in a society which was based on brotherhood and moral values. His studies in Islamic history led him to the conclusion that such a society had once existed. However, that society could not be created so long as the people were thinking in terms of nationalism and patriotism. Dr. Iqbal wrote in 1910 in his private notebook, "And what is patriotism to a subtle form of idolatry; a deification of a material object. The patriotic songs of various nations will bear me out in my calling patriotism a deification of a material object. Islam could not tolerate idolatry in any form... What was to be demolished by Islam could not be made the very principle of its structure as a political community. The fact that the Prophet prospered and died in a place not his birth-place is perhaps a mystic hint to the same effect." Thus, Dr. Iqbal tried to replace patriotism by Islam. In his eyes, Islam was no longer just a religion. It was transformed into a "race-making force" and the Muslims had become a race. In order to achieve his ideal society, Iqbal had to rely upon the Muslims of the whole world. The world situation probably helped him to realise that it was not possible to find a

Muslim capable of leading the whole world. Therefore, Iqbal said that "for the present, every Muslim nation must sink into her own deeper self, temporarily focus her vision on herself alone until all are strong and powerful to form a living republic." This change in the ideas of Iqbal did not take place overnight. It appears that it started at a time when Iqbal was examining the characteristics of the West. The result was that Iqbal who was once proud of his country said on his return from Europe: "If the nationality (Qaumiyat) is bound with a place (Muqam), then, for Muslims, this place is neither India, nor Persia, nor Syria, but Madina, the place of the Prophet".

It is also contended that Iqbal realised that the slogan all-India nationalism, if realised, would lead to perpetual political ascendancy of the Hindus who were in a majority in India. Such a Hindu-dominated state would impede the cultural and religious development of the Muslim commounity. Hence, Iqbal suggested a federal form of Government with a weak centre so that the units could enjoy autonomy. Iqbal stated in his Presidential address to the Muslim League in 1930, "I would never advise the Muslims of India to a system, whether of British or of Indian origin, which virtually negatives the principle of true federation or fails to recognise them as a distinct political entity". Iqbal was also afraid that the concept of nationalism might develop separatist feelings in the brotherhood of Islam in the world. He described the Western concept of nationalism as a deadly poison for the Muslim brotherhood and its active propagation a subtle design of imperialist powers to weaken Islam. He substituted the Islamic concept of the whole world as the family of God for accursed nationalism and degraded imperialism. Iqbal also considered Indian nationalism as bourgeois nationalism and the Indian National Congress as a bourgeois association. Hence, he denounced both Indian nationalism and the Indian National Congress which preached it.

Ideology of a New Muslim State

The view of Iqbal was that the year 1799 marked the lowest point of Islamic political decay. With the defeat of Tipu Sultan, the decline of Islam was at its culmination. However, there was a revival of Islam in the nineteenth century. With the activities of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan in India, Mufti Alam Jan in Russia and Syed Jamal-ud-din in Afghanistan, there began the phase of Islamic awakening.

Iqbal felt that the destiny of the Muslims in India lay in the formation of a state for themlseves. He regarded the Muslims as an "All-India minority" and even called them a nation. He was opposed to a "unitary Indian nation" as the plan for domination by the majority. He felt that in united India, there was no future for the Muslims. He considered the problem of India as not national but international. India was a land of many nations and there could be no peace in the country until the constituent elements got the opportunity of developing, without breaking with the past. He felt that India was never a nation. To quote him, "India is Asia in miniature. India is a continent of the human beings belonging to different races, languages, religions etc." Iqbal became an advocate of the formation of a "consolidated Muslim state in India". He declared in 1930. "I would like to see the Punjab, the North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan

amalgamated into a single state". He supported the demand for "Muslim India within India". He supported the Communal Award. To sum up, he became the spiritual and ideological protagonist of Pakistanist separatism. Hence, the Muslims in Pakistan regard Iqbal one of the early founders of Pakistan and hold his poetry books their holy book, next to the Quran.

His opposition to Secularism

Iqbal was opposed to materialism embodied in modern nationalistic creeds and formulas. He hated Western civilisation on account of its love for nationalism at the cost of spiritualism. He denounced Machiavelli as a "messenger of Satan" because he divorced politics from ethics. He was an advocate of the Islamic concept of Faqr. He considered religion as a force of progress. According to him, religion "which is neither dogma nor priesthood nor ritual can alone ethically prepare the modern man for the burden of the great responsibility which the advancement of modern science necessarily involves and restores to him that attitude of faith which makes him capable of winning a personality here and retaining it hereafter." He adhered to the tenets of the Quran and condemned the godlessness preached by Nietzsche.

Iqbal was in favour of a theocratic state governed by the laws of the Shariat. He advocated the organisation of politics and administration on spiritual basis. According to him, religion shapes all phases of life. He did not accept the modern concepts of the sovereignty of the people or the General Will. He stood for the sovereignty of God which is expressed through the laws of Shariat. His view was that the Quran united "religion and state, ethics and politics in a single revelation much in the same way as Plato does in the Republic". He put emphasis on the fact that unlike Christianity, Islam did not believe in the duality of Church versus Empire. The spiritual and temporal world could not be bifurcated. To quote him, "The state according to Islam, is only an effort to realise the spiritual in an human organisation." Iqbal could not reconcile himself to the ideas of a secular state.

It is true that Iqbal believed in a theocratic state, but he did not subscribe to the cult of the ruler as the viceregent of God. The ruler in the theocratic state could not abuse authority and become a dictator. The aim of the state was to realise spiritual perfection and development of the religious life of the people.

According to Iqbal, a Muslim who regards Islam as a private affair, ceases to be a true Muslim. The acceptance of secularism would lead to irreligiousness, religious scepticism and economic conflict. Secularism is irrelevant to the Muslims because Islam does not bifurcate the unity of man into the church and the state etc. The rejection of the religious ideals of Islam involves the rejection of the social order and vice versa. The view of Dr. Iqbal was that the separation of religion would make the former subordinate and subservient to the temporal authority. Its logical outcome would be the extinction of religion itself.

Iqbal suggested that socialism was a negative force. It was mechanical, bereft of institution as well as awareness of varieties of religious experience. The view of Iqbal was that the ideal of Islam was worth living and worth dying for. Iqbal believed that secularism would "de-Islamise" Muslims and would be a great obstacle in the emergence of a great nation.

Progressive Revivalist

Iqbal was a revivalist and believed in the sovereignty of God and Islam. However, he was not an absolute revivalist. He suggested changes in Islamic thought. No doubt he advocated that the tenets of the Quran should be followed, but he did not ignore the validity of the views of the liberal schools of Muslim jurisprudence. He always kept in his mind the fact that the situation had completely changed in modern times.

Instead of describing God as the traditional Being, he described Him as the immanent God who did not exist somewhere outside the universe and controlled it from there. He is a part of us and faces our problems from within. He denounced the traditional idea of God existing far away from the world. He repudiated the concept of a fixed and static universe as expounded by the orthodox Islamic thought. He is said to have declared that those who did not enjoy life, were greater sinners than those who did not accept the existence of God. He did not want man to resign himself passively to the will of God. He would like to become His viceregent through creative activity. Thus, Iqbal was not an absolute revivalist but a progressive revivalist.

Views on Western Civilisation

The view of Iqbal was that the West symbolises the values of materialism. It is against spiritualism and religiosity. It stands for reason and discards love which is the basis of Eastern civilisation. The materialism of the West created a capitalist society which could not secure the good of the people because its basis was the profit of the few. Everything was made subordinate to the interests of the ruling elite. Science, philosophy, democracy, Constitution and the fundamental rights of equality and liberty were subservient to the exploiting class. The triumphs of society were want and unemployment. The machine had crushed humanity. Man had lost his individuality and was condemned to eternal slavery. The Western man was living in open conflict with his self in the domain of thought and open conflict with others in the domain of economic and political life. He was not the master but the slave of the system.

However, this does not mean that Iqbal did not find anything good in Western civilisation. He was impressed by the scientific attitude of mind and the initiative of Europeans, the untiring energy, the immense vitality and hectic activity of European life and the vision of tremendous possibilities before the human beings. The Western influence made him challenge the attitude of resignation and quiet contentment encouraged by Sufism. It also made him revolutionize the Islamic thought by repudiating the concept of a fixed and static universe presided over by a dictatorial God. Iqbal came to believe that the world was a dynamic thing and was being advanced by man and by God through man.

Criticism of Capitalism

Iqbal was a great critic of capitalism. His criticism was based on the Quranic principle, "He made the earth for his creatures". The fact that the earth is only for God, implies that any monopolistic claim to it either by the capitalist or the landlord is an unjust interference with the divine law.

Iqbal believed that he alone is a true believer in the majesty of God who regards God as the true owner of all wealth and considers himself only a trustee.

Iqbal was an opponent of exploitation in all forms. He sponsored the claims of the peasants and labourers. He even predicted a revolution against the iniquities of capitalism. He criticised capitalism in the following words:—

Go and awaken the poor and the dispossessed of my Universe
And shake the walls of the rich men's palaces to their foundations
Let the favour of self-confidence warm up the blood of the slaves,
Let the frail sparrow hurt itself against the eagle!
The day of the sovereignty of the masses approaches fast,
Demolish the old relics wherever you find them.
Is there a field which yields no livelihood to the peasant?
Go and burn to the ground every grain of wheat in it!
God is (often) sold away for a (Sijda), the idols for circumambulation.
Better put out the lights of the mosques and the temples!
I am disgusted with all these places of worship built in marble;
Go and build a lowly hut of clay for my worship!

Man is still a miserable prey to exploitation and imperialism: is it not a grievous calamity that man should prey on man?

The glitter of the modern civilization dazzles the eyesight: but this is merely an artistry of false beads!

Science, on which prided the wise men of the West, is but a sword of battle in the blood-stained grip of greed.

No magic of political policy can strengthen a civilization which rests on the quick-sands of capitalism!"

Socialism

It is true Iqbal criticised capitalism but this does not mean that he was a socialist. He did not have any sound grounding in the economics and sociology of socialism. According to W. C. Smith, "Iqbal was not intellectually a socialist. He did not know, analytically and logically what is wrong with capitalism. But he was emotionally a socialist because he loved mankind." Iqbal was not aware of the positive role of socialism in denouncing capitalism. He looked at the problems from the Quranic standpoint and was repelled by the materialist vehemence of several schools of socialist thought. Iqbal was also opposed to socialist tendency to exaggerate the economic demands of the body with the consequent minimisation of the claims of the mind and the spirit. His ignorance of socialism is appalling. In one of the poems composed in 1922, Iqbal put Lenin on a level with the Kaiser in hell due to his totally false assumption that socialism was concerned only with the body and it had nothing to do with the spirit. In being materialistic and opposed to true religion, i.e., Islam, Iqbal bracketed socialism with capitalism. (Modern Islam in India).

Iqbal was critical of the socialist developments in the West. He wholeheartedly appreciated the revolutionary role played by Marx and his ideology. He agreed with Marx about the character of bourgeois philosophy and society. He also knew that the Russian Revolution was not an insigni-

ficant event in world history. It was the triumph of the people and the realisation of the dream of the under-dog. It was a challenge to Western imperialism. It would end colonialism and slavery from the face of the earth.

Iqbal found many points of similarity between Islam and Marxian ideology. Both aim at destruction of autocracy in the world. Both view capitalism with disfavour. Both disapprove of priesthood and the church as organised institution. Iqbal considered Islam as a form of socialism which was not made use of by the Muslims. However, he did not agree with all the aspects of socialism. He has given expression to his points of disagreement from Marx in his poem. According to Iqbal, Marxism is wholly concerned with matter and ignores the soul and spirit. However, Islam attaches equal importance to the body and the soul and gives priority to the former. Iqbal also rejected the materialist interpretation of history. Materialism is no doubt an effective weapon against the Mullahs and the Sufis, but it is not the only thing to be aspired for. The view of Iqbal was that the great defect of Marxism is its denial of God and spiritual values. Iqbal felt that the materialist interpretation of history was a typcial product of Western intellectualism.

Iqbal did not agree with the Marxian interpretation of state and Government. He could not think of a classless society where the state was to wither away. Dr. Javed Iqbal described his father's socialism as Islamic socialism or the Islamic interpretation of socialism.

Socialism stands for a state where religion has no place and it becomes a private affair of the individual. The view of Iqbal was that such an ideology cannot "cure the ills of despairing humanity". Iqbal believed that socialism would make Government "Satanic" and that would lead to disunity. It will have disastrous consequences irrespective of the form of government. Iqbal attached so much importance to religion that he would have nothing to do with Swarajya divorced from religion.

Western Democracy and Islamic Democracy

Iqbal regarded democracy as a major ingredient of the modern Western system, but that democracy was different from and even opposed to Islamic democracy. Both were poles apart. Western democracy believes in the sovereignty of the people and its cardinal principles are equality and liberty. The political and social set-up in a democracy was the result of reaction to the past autocratic and feudal structure of Europe.

Iqbal was in favour of the basic principles of democracy but his view was that the theory and practice of Western democracy was not consistent with Islam. Democrary envisaged by Islam is not democracy in the Western sense of the word. According to Islam, sovereignty is vested not in the people but in God. Western society was based on materialism and exploitation. There were certain inherent drawbacks and shortcomings in the theory of democracy. Its notion of equality was misleading. It did not take into account the inherent capacities and endowments of the individuals. The heads were counted and not weighed. Wisdom was not given due consideration in democracy and its principle was majority rule. The majority may not always be wise and therefore Iqbal was not prepared to accept the majority

view. His view was that the liberty which Western democracy conferred on the people, was a sham. Democracy was accompanied by imperialism. It furthered the interests of the exploiters. Hence, the view of Iqbal was that democracy could not be a reality. In the garb of democracy operates "the demon of autocracy". Liberty, rights etc. were the camouflage of capitalism.

The view of Iqbal was that democracy is only a continuation of the old authoritarian rule of the past. There was no vital difference between democracy and autocratic rule. Democracy was a fraud on the people who were given the semblance of power and denied its substance. Democracy was not an ideal form of polity. It "lets loose all sorts of aspirations and grievances which were suppressed and unrealised under autocracy. It arouses hopes and ambitions often quite unpractical and it relies not on authority but argument or controversy on the platform, in the press, in Parliament, gradually to educate people to the acceptance of a solution which may not be ideal but which is the only practical one in the circumstances of the time."

Iqbal viewed Western democracy as imperfect and undesirable because it lacked spiritual content. The democracy of Europe originated mainly in the economic regeneration of European societies.

Iqbal condemned Western democracy and asked the people to accept Islamic democracy. According to him, Islamic democracy did not "grow out of the extension of economic opportunity; it is a spiritual principle based on the assumption that every human being is a centre of latent power, the possibilities of which can be developed by cultivating a certain type of character. Out of the plebian material, Islam has formed man of the noblest type of life and power."

In his Islamic democracy, Iqbal put great emphasis on moral considerations. He did not abhor the herd. He also did not stress the economic aspect of social and political life. What mattered to him was righteousness. Iqbal's democracy was not of the common people but of the elite. It was to be "presided over by the most unique individual possible on this earth". Iqbal was convinced that Islamic democracy will not degenerate into autocracy. Its basis was shifted "from economic exploitation to a spiritual purification and better economic adjustment."

The view of Iqbal was that a Government based on the concept of One God will be stable and better than democracy of the Western type. The principle of Unity of God is a living factor in the intellectual and emotional life of mankind. The other cardinal principles of Islamic democracy were obedience to Law, tolerance, and universalism.

The Islamic democracy of Iqbal remained mostly an ideal and a dream. Iqbal knew that Islamic democracy had existed for a short period of 30 years only in the early period of Islamic history. The subsequent history of Islam was one of absolute rule. In modern times also, no Muslim country was making any conscious efforts to realise the ideal of Islamic democracy.

Iqbal stood for removing the defects of modern democracy. His view was that monarchy possessed certain merits as compared with other forms of Government. He put more stress on obedience to the perfect man. He hated certain features of monarchic Government. Eternal monarchy appeared to be unnatural to him.

The Islamic democracy of Iqbal combines the virtues of monarchy and democracy. One can describe it as Islamization of democracy and monarchy. The emphasis put on Government by the perfect man may be construed as a preference for monarchy and his emphasis on equality as a preference for democracy. Iqbal held that liberty is not possible in democracy because of the economic forces that prevailed in the social structure. The notion of liberty in a democracy is usually perverted and leads to licence. It is boundless and perilous. Iqbal was convinced that real liberty was possible only in Islamic democracy. Iqbal was a great champion of liberty and freedom and he regarded slavery as a curse. Iqbal had all admiration for those who attempted to achieve power. He praised Mussolini for this reason only. Power devoid of ethical consideration is a weapon of terror and evil. Western democracy is not able to realise the essential significance of the individual and results in the subordination of the individual to mass. In Islamic democracy, the principle of unity with God liberates the individuals from slavery. It is only in Islamic democracy that obedience provides a sound basis for the enjoyment of liberty. There are no man-made laws. The divine laws are perfect and eternal. There should be no complaint about the strictness and rigidity of the laws because those are intended to liberate the individual.

The Islamic Community

According to Iqbal, the Islamic community is not organised through human laws. It follows the Divine law as propounded in the Quran. The Quran is a living book whose wisdom is eternal and uncreated. Its words are undoubted and unchanged. The secrets of life are written therein. There is no question of free speculation regarding legal matters in the Islamic community. Strict conformity to Divine law will give stability and tranquillity to the Islamic community.

The visible focus of Islamic community will be Mecca. The Islamic community will achieve strength and perfect solidarity by adopting a fixed communal objective which is "the preservation and propagation of unitarianism." The common communal objective is the Islamization of the entire world. Whatever comes in the way of the propagation of unitarianism should be destroyed. The Muslims should see that the false gods of nationalism, race, colour etc. are shattered in order to save humanity. They should realise that they are the deputies of God on earth. They should discover the "sensation of self". This can be done by guarding the communal traditions. The function of history is to record the past and illumine the conscience of the people. It should contribute to the process of self-awareness. If history is forgotten, the people will be lost into nothingness. Therefore, history should be preserved. The everlasting life is not possible if there is a break between the past and the present. Life itself is nothing but "a wave of consciousness of continuity".

Society and Individual

According to Iqbal, the individual is inseparable from society. His truest self achieves fulfilment in society. He wins respect by being a member of society. Society is organised by individuals. The highest aim of the individual is to achieve union with society. Society watches and controls all the

actions of the individual who owes his body and soul to it. It is in society that his individuality achieves firmness and stability and unity in multiplicity. Society or the community is the supreme entity. The individual cannot fulfil the purpose of life in isolation from society. The interests of the individual and society are not antagonistic but mutual and complementary. Islam and the Islamic community are not hostile to the uniqueness of the individual. The social and economic arrangements prevailing in society are the greatest hurdles to liberty and individualism. Islam recognises the worth of the individual and disciplines him to give away his all to the service of God and man. Its possibilities are not yet exhausted. It can still create a new world where the poor tax the rich and where human society is founded on the equality of spirits. Iqbal knew that uncontrolled ego or individualism will lead to anarchy. The need is to discipline it. Iqbal put emphasis not so much on self alone but on selflessness. The nature of the self is to be both free and bound. Such a community of selves owes "the perfecting of its education to the unity of God." The belief and faith in the unity of God and man is essential for the promotion of the goodness, strength and stability of society.

Superman

The idea of Superman is prominent in the writings of Iqbal. He did not approve of certain traits of the Superman of Nietzsche. However, he was influenced by Islamic teachings in his view of the Superman. The Superman is not above morality. He has to follow the discipline prescribed by Islam. The Superman should possess power but he was not released from all conventional, moral and religious restraints. The Superman is the rider of destiny. He will establish the brotherhood of man and bring peace to the world. The Quran also speaks of the Superman. He possesses all the attributes of a true follower of Islam. He is "lowly with the believers and mighty against the rejectors". He "will fight in the way of God". He is the image of God. He is a "mirror reflecting his name and attributes."

The Superman of Iqbal is not the Superman in the usual sense of the word. He is a perfect citizen and an ideal member of the Islamic community which will be composed of such Supermen. It is not impossible to develop such Supermen. What is required is only to understand the spirit of Islam and create a society in keeping with that spirit. Iqbal had high hopes for the realisation of such a society.

Contradictions and Paradoxes

Iqbal's poetry, socio-political thought, philosophical formulations and economic ideals are subjected to severe criticism and praise by various writers. The reason given is the inconsistent and contradictory postures of Iqbal who attempted to be modern without understanding the dynamism of modernism. He took a liberal stand without taking liberalism to its logical end. He was for democracy and was also its critic. He admired socialism without understanding its fundamentals. No wonder, Iqbal is described as a democrat, a socialist, a Fascist, a liberal, a prophet of Muslim India and the "spiritual founder of Pakistan".

Iqbal was not a consistent thinker. He himself acknowledged this fact in these words: "In the domain of political thought, I am living in open

conflict with myself." Iqbal was not a great system-builder. He stated, "I am afraid I have no philosophy to teach". Hence, "It is hardly suprising that there should be inconsistencies in his outlook—these inconsistencies and contradictions are manifest throughout the whole fabric and his social and political ideas." The thinking of iqbal was full of paradoxes as a result of a mixture of his political thinking and poetry. As a political thinker, he had a limited and sectarian purpose. His poetical temperament demanded a much wider canvas. As a poet, he was emotional, universal and liberal. As a political thinker, he had to be business-like, sectarian and orthodox. That resulted in paradoxes in his thoughts and actions. One important reason for contradictions in his political ideas is his attempt to ride two horses. As a Muslim he wanted to accept the basic tenets of the Quran. As a philosopher, he adhered to an absolute organic idealism with the keen desire to establish an ideal society. His Pan-Islamism was full of contradictions. If Pan-Islamism implied a desire to secure the realisation of the ideals and values of Islam in his ideal society, nothing could be said against it, but Iqbal did not consistently follow it. Often, he mixed up with this a totally different idea of uniting the different Muslim countries in a Pan-Islamic union. Such a philosophical confusion was responsible for political confusion. As a Muslim theologian, Iqbal accepted the supremacy of the Shariat. As a philosopher, he stood for individualism (Khudi) which he did not define correctly.

Iqbal believed in the fullest development of the individual or Khudi. For that, he loved spiritual democracy. Iqbal did not sanction the sovereignty of the people. Thus, from the concept of spiritual democracy, Iqbal did not draw the idea of political democracy. Iqbal depicts his spiritual democracy in his poem "Mysteries of Selflessness", as a "community based on divine principles enunciated by Prophet Muhammad. It is composed of ideal men following in the footsteps of the Prophet who have been enjoined to establish such a society. They are made by God to be the soul of all people dwelling upon earth." In his scheme of spiritual democracy there was a Superman similar to that of Nietzsche. This Superman is not in the usual sense of the term but a "perfect citizen and an ideal member of the Islamic community". The view of Iqbal was that it was not impossible to develop such Supermen. In his spiritual democracy, Iqbal saw the possibility of a complete identification between the individual and the community. His scheme is analogous to the Hegelian notion of "the personality of the state" wherein obedience of the individual to the community is regarded his highest virtue. Such a contradiction has been described by Schimmel as the "wonderful paradox of freedom in servantship". Iqbal not only condemned the Western democracies as imperialistic but also made a call for "Run away from democracy and be the slave of the Perfect Man." In the garb of the sanctity of the Shariat, Iqbal championed the reactionary, the medievalist and even the Fascist cult of the Hero. Iqbal was a severe critic of Western democracies in which "heads are counted and not weighed" for its majority rule and the kind of sham liberty which the Western democracies confer on their people. He did not accept that democracy as the rule of the people, for the people and by the people, could be a reality. In the garb of such democracy, he found "the demon of autocracy" continuing and liberty, rights etc. as "camouflage of capitalism". Iqbal became a prophet of action and strength. Iqbal says that Plato was one of the ancient

flock of sheep who poisoned the minds of the people by the gospel of inaction and penury. That shows that he did not thoroughly understand the vitality of the thought of Plato.

The gospel of activism, freedom and viceregency of God was reserved by Iqbal for man only. He excluded women from a share in the active life of the community.

The thought of Iqbal is full of paradoxes and oscillations between modernity and antiquarianism. He did not show his awareness of the reality of the emerging new class, its aspirations and ambitions. He rejected liberalism but did not offer any alternative. He could not free himself from the mooring of tradition. Dr. Moin Shakir writes, "His inconsistencies and contradictions make it difficult to regard him as a systematic thinker or a consistent philosopher. The story of Iqbal represents a tragedy of a great genius". (Khilafat to Partition, p. 122).

The view of Dr. Moin Shakir is that the mind of Iqbal was basically medieval. He attempted to re-interpret and revitalise some of the tenets of Islam without much success. Dr. Moin Shakir does not accept the view of Gibb that Iqbal was the exponent of the most sweeping modernist reformulation of Islamic doctrine. He criticised all the forces of socio-political and intellectual modernisation of society. His view of democracy was a negation of modern democratic ideas. He appreciated monarchy and emphasized the necessity of obedience to the perfect man. His notion of democracy was nothing but a combination of monarchy and democracy. His Islamic democracy is not the democracy of the common man but of unique individuals. It was to be presided over by the most unique individual possible on the earth. His view that democracy is possible only in a Muslim community is not correct. Iqbal was not in favour of elections without which there could be no democracy. In the ideal society of Iqbal, there was aristocracy of talent rather than Government based on the consent of all the people. All authority was concentrated in the aristocracy of talent. His opposition to nationalism was not warranted. He opposed Indian nationalism for deeper emotional and spiritual reasons. He did not understand the true ethos of the nationalist sentiment and nationalist movement in India. His view that Indian nationalism was a divisive force was not correct. As a matter of fact, Indian nationalism was the greatest factor of the political unity of the Indian people. His view that India was not a nation, was not correct. His idea of nationalism in relation of Muslim minority shows a communal approach to the national problem. His view that India is not a nation simply because the Muslims are in a minority in the country, shows a superficial appreciation of the realities of the country. He thought that in India Islam and nationalism were not identical, but in other countries where the Muslims are in a majority, Islam has accommodated nationalism. This is not logic. If nationalism was good in Muslim majority countries, it should be so in India also. Iqbal had no alternative to offer for the liberation of India if nationalism was not adequate. His opposition to Indian nationalism gave an impetus to the separatist Muslim nationalism in India. His attitude towards secularism did great harm to the Muslims. His emphasis on cultural role of Islam and Muslim communal identity lacked spiritual motives. Iqbal's understanding of socialism was not adequate. His attempt to integrate Islam

was not successful. Islamic community of Iqbal is totalitarian in character as there is no scope for dissent. Ahmed Ali writes about Iqbal, "His thought despised imagination and his imagination the thought. Not being able to equilibrium, he often annulled the one at the expense of the other. We therefore find his work full of contradictions."

M.A. Jinnah (1876-1948)

Qaid-i-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah was born on 23 December, 1876 at Karachi and he died at Karachi on 10 September, 1948. His father was a merchant who sent him to England for training as a Barrister. While in England, he was attracted by the political views of the Briitsh Liberals and Dadabhai Naoroji. He came back to India in 1896. Through his ability, integrity and hard work, he ultimately became one of the best known lawyers in India. He joined the Indian National Congress and in 1906 worked as Private Secretary to Dadabhai Naoroji. In 1909, the Bombay Muslim constituency elected him to the Imperial Legislative Council where his ability and independence won him recognition. He came into contact with Gokhale and a warm friendship grew between the two. Gokhale had high hopes from him. He said about Jinnah, "He has true stuff in him and that freedom from all sectarian prejudice which makes him the best ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity". In May 1915, Jinnah said that Gokhale was "a great political Rishi, a master of the finance of India and the greatest champion of education and sanitation".

In 1913, he was persuaded by Maulana Muhammad Ali to join the Muslim League. He did so on the assurance that the aims of the Muslim League were then similar to those of the Congress and his membership of the Muslim League would not imply disloyalty to "the larger national cause to which his life was dedicated". In 1914, Jinnah went to England as a member of a deputation sent by the Indian National Congress in connection with the proposed reform of the India Council. When the Home Rule Leagues were started by Tilak and Annie Besant in 1916, Jinnah did not join them, but when Annie Besant was interned, he joined the Bombay Home Rule League. In October, 1916, Jinnah presided over the Sixteenth Bombay Provincial Conference at Ahmedabad and pleaded for unity between the Hindus and Muslims. He presided over the Lucknow session of the All-India Muslim League in December 1916 and pleaded for Hindu-Muslim unity. He signed the Memorandum of the Nineteen and supported the Congress-League scheme. The Lucknow Pact was signed in 1916 at Lucknow between the Congress and the Muslim League when Jinnah was the President.

When Mahatma Gandhi started the Non-cooperation movement, Jinnah kept aloof because he believed in constitutional methods. He had no liking for the Khilafat movement which appeared to him to be unrealistic. He was a member of the Muddiman Committee and the Skeen Committee. When the All-Parties national convention met at Calcutta in the last week of December 1928 to discuss the Nehru Report, Jinnah put forward his amendments in which he demanded that the Muslims should be given 33 1/3 percent of the seats in the Central Legislature. His amendments were not accepted. At a meeting of the All-India Muslim League held on 28

March 1929, Jinnah put forward his Fourteen Points which were intended to safeguard the interests of the Muslims in India. For some time, Jinnah left India and went to England and started practising law before the Privy Council. He took an active part when elections were held under the Government of India Act, 1935 in 1937. From this time onwards, Jinnah rose higher and higher as the leader of the Muslims. He presided over the Lahore session of the All-India Muslim League held in March 1940 and it was under his Presidentship that the Pakistan Resolution was passed. Jinnah continued to work whole-heartedly for the achievement of Pakistan. As the permanent President of the Muslim League, he led the Muslims of India and ultimately the independent state of Pakistan was created on 14 August 1947 with Jinnah as the Governor-General of Pakistan. On 10 September 1948, he died.

It has rightly been said that the creation of Pakitsan in 1947 would have proved impossible without the leadership of Jinnah. It was he who persuaded the British that partition was both necessary and morally correct. It was he who pressurized the dissident Muslim leaders in the Punjab, Sind and North-West Frontier Province to fall in the line behind him and the Muslim League. He embodied the desires and aspirations of those Muslims in India who wanted a separate sovereign state of their own.

Political Thought of Jinnah

The political thought of Jinnah can be divided into two parts viz., Jinnah as a nationalist and Jinnah as a communalist. Jinnah started his career as a nationalist. To begin with, Jinnah was a liberal nationalist. He was associated with the top-most liberal leadership of the country. For some time, he acted as Secretary to Dadabhai Naoroji and from him he learnt the ideas of liberalism. He was also a friend of Gokhale. He is said to have remarked that "It is my ambition to become a Muslim Gokhale". He was also influenced by Surendranath Bannerjea and C. R. Das. To quote Jinnah, "I learnt my first lesson in politics at the feet of Sir Surendranath Bannerjea. I looked up to him as my leader". At this stage, Jinnah accepted nationalism, democracy, secularism and unity of the country as the goal of the country. British Liberals had also influence on him. The view of Jinnah was that liberalism demanded rule of law, equality, impartial judiciary, cheap procedure and accessible courts, abolition of privileges of classes and abolition of the power of money. The liberal creed of Jinnah stood for freedom, constitutionalism and absence of any type of fanaticism in political and social life, cooperation with the British Government, constitutional agitation for right causes, unity of the country and the rule of law. The view of Jinnah was that British civilisation had exerted a tremendous influence on all aspects of life in India. He had respect for British fairplay and justice. He believed that the new national consciousness of the Indian people owed much to the attitude and policies of the British Government.

The view of Jinnah was that democracy could not be bestowed upon the Indians as a gift and they should get it as a matter of right. The approach of Jinnah to politics was secular. He wanted the people to foget religious differences. He did not agree with the leaders of the Aligarh movement that if the Britishers left the country, Hindu Raj would be established. He assured the Muslims that no Bill would be passed by the Legislature

in the teeth of opposition from the Muslims. His view was that the reservation of a few seats for the Muslims was not very important.

The attitude of Jinnah was always one of honourable cooperation with the Government. He was secular in the true sense of the word. His secular attitude distinguished him from Gandhiji. His view was that the mixing up of religion and politics was detrimental to the harmony of the political life of the country. He had no interest in the Khilafat movement because it was not a political movement and was not in keeping with his liberal creed. He warned Gandhiji not to encourage the religious fanaticism of the Muslim priests. In spite of that, Gandhiji personally led the Khilafat movement but Jinnah did not support it. Gandhiji and the Muslim priests considered religion as the dominant factor in life but Jinnah denied it. His view was that the anti-Liberal programmes and methods adopted by Gandhiji would lead to disaster, "complete disorganisation and chaos". He resigned from the Home Rule League on account of his differences with the other Congress leaders. Jinnah never approved of the employment of extra-constitutional methods.

Jinnah had no respect for the new Muslim leaders who were bigoted persons. He wanted to discard the political ideology of the Aligarh movement which was producing fanatical leadership. The view of Dr. Moin Shakir is that Jinnah left the Congress when he realised that it had shed its liberalism and transformed itself into a mass organisation. He started denying and contradicting whatever he had said before. The year 1920 divides the two phases of the life of Jinnah.

Jinnah found that Mahatma Gandhi was the leader of the Congress and he himself had no chance to become the leader of the Congress in the presence of Gandhiji. The mind of Jinnah was so constituted that he could not accept the leadership of anybody else and hence he left the Congress and joined the Muslim League which he built up as a great force under his own leadership. He became the greatest advocate of the two-nation theory. He convinced the Muslims that they were a separate nation and that they could not be under Hindu Raj. He declared that the reason why there had not been a settlement between the Hindus and Muslims was that the Congress was a Hindu organisation and the Congress leaders had always at the back of their minds the bias that the Muslims had to come within the ken of the Congress and the Hindu Raj, that they were a minority and as such could demand safeguasds as a minority. He emphatically told the Congress leaders that the Muslims always had at their back the bias that they were a separate entity. He also declared on 22 March 1940 that the Muslims of India were not a minority but a nation by any definition. The Hindus and Muslims belonged to two different religious philosophies, social customs and literatures. They neither inter-married nor inter-dined. They belonged to two different civilisations which were based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects on life and of life were different. They derived their inspiration from different sources of history. They had different epics. Their heroes were different. Very often, the hero of one was the foe of the other. Their victories and defeats overlapped. "To yoke together two such nations under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be so built up for the Government of such a state".

When the Congress started the Quit India movement, Jinnah asked the

Muslims to keep away from it. He adopted a policy of the denunciation of the Congress leaders and non-cooperation with them. He called upon the Muslims to "stand solid by our goal of Pakistan. Either we achieve Pakistan or we perish". He told the students of the Aligarh Muslim University that the sole aim of Gandhi was to establish Hindu Raj over the whole of the Indian continent. On 23 March, 1943, he gave the following message to the Muslims of India, "We, the Muslims, must rely mainly upon our inherent qualities, our own national potentialities, our own internal solidarity and our own united will to face the future". He described Nehru as a double-dealer and Gandhi a communalist working under the influence of Hindu Mahasabha. He called Maulana Azad the Muslim President of the Hindu Congress. He first accepted and later on rejected the Cabinet Mission scheme. He proclaimed 16 August, 1946 as the Direct Action day. He asked the Council of the Muslim League to give up the constitutional methods and resort to force. The Direct Action day led to Great Calcutta Killing. He boycotted the Interim Government headed by Nehru but later on joined it so that he may be able to put a check on the working of the Interim Government, He boycotted the Constituent Assembly which met on 9 December, 1946. The Muslim League continued agitation for Pakistan under his leadership. Ultimately, June 3 Plan was argeed to by the Muslim League and the Congress by which India was to be partitioned and the Muslims were to have a separate state of Pakistan.

The question has been asked why Jinnah who was an ardent nationalist, became a diehard communalist. Many reasons have been given for the change in the attitude of Jinnah. One important reason was the obsessive egoism of Jinnah. He could not tolerate that somebody should eclipse him. M. C. Chagla writes, "He had to be a leader and the prime-mover in whatever cause he worked. With the emergence of Gandhiji in Indian politics, Jinnah felt that his importance would gradually diminish". (Roses in December, p. 79). Dr. Moin Shakir also subscribes to the same view. Jinnah believed in giving commands to his followers and such a man could not accept any superior. Self-confidence bred an extreme type of self-righteousness. His behaviour towards Sir Sikander Hayat Khan, Saadullah, Fazlul Haq, Begum Shah Nawaz, and Sir Sultan Ahmad is an example in point. It is said that Jinnah was more haughy and arrogant than the proudest of Pharaohs. (Khilafat to Partition, Pp. 199-200).

Another reason is that Jinnah was the antithesis of Gandhi and Nehru and hence they could not pull together in the Congress and therefore Jinnah left the Congress as it could not serve his purpose. It is pointed out that Gandhi was a man of God who believed in non-violence. Jinnah was a firm believer in practical politics. If Gandhiji was an embodiment of simplicity and an advocate of Khadi, Jinnah was the opposite of it as he lived in high style. Jinnah could not have tolerated Jawaharlal Nehru in the same organisation and hence he left.

Another reason for the change was the obstinacy of Jinnah. He was obstinate by temperament. Once Jinnah adopted the communal line, he did not stop till he got Pakistan. A dominant characteristic of Jinnah was his tenacity. M. C. Chagla writes, "Once he made up his mind, nothing in the world could divert him from his chosen objectives. No temptation, no bribe, no pressure had the slightest effect". (Ibid, p. 80).

Miss Fatima Jinnah, the sister of Jinnah, had also a hand in the change

in his life. The first wife of Jinnah died and his second wife, a Parsi lady, left him. Jinnah was looked after by his sister Fatima Jinnah who thus came to have an opportunity to influence him. Fatima Jinnah was a staunch communalist and Jinnah was considerably affected by her. M. C. Chagla writes, "After her death, Jinnah's sole companion at home was his sister, Fatima, who was even more communal-minded and partly responsible for the transformation brought about in Jinnah subsequently". (Ibid, p. 119).

Another cause of change was the poor calibre of the other Muslim leaders in the Muslims League. That gave Jinnah an opportunity to become their leader. Thus the Muslim League provided a forum to satisfy his lust for acquiring and asserting supremacy.

It is said that Jinnah went over to the Muslim League as his vanity was hurt when he was not chosen to place India's point of view before the British Government in the Second Round Table Conference. His feeling was that he was being reduced to a man of little consequence as Mahatma Gandhi was the leader of the Congress. His conclusion was that "If he had to have a place under the Sun, he would have to stand on a communal platform." That explains his shifting over to the Muslim League.

It is also contended that Mahatma Gandhi and the other Congress leaders gave undue importance to Jinnah as compared with other Muslims in India and thereby made him all the more haughty and headstrong. Mahatma Gandhi called him Qaid-i-Azam and the other Congress leaders accepted the Muslim League as the only representative association of the Muslims. M. C. Chagla writes, "Jinnah and his communalist following seemed all-important. In comparison, we counted for nothing. It was Gandhiji who gave Jinnah the appellation of Qaid-i-Azam which Jinnah gratefully and proudly accepted. It was then assumed..that the Muslim masses were behind Jinnah." (Roses in December, p. 100).

The policy of the British Government played its part in changing the attitude of Jinnah. British bureaucracy in India helped Jinnah against the Congress. The Viceroys of India and visiting dignitaries with plans and schemes always went out of the way to concede his point of view. They gave weight to the whims of Jinnah and thereby helped him to continue to think in terms of Islam and the two-nation theory.

Jinnah was essentially a politician who posed himself as the custodian of the interests of the Muslims in India. He did not know their language. He did not believe in Muslim dress. He never visited a mosque till he was forced by circumstances. He wanted power and authority which could not be got by him if he continued to remain in the Congress. The Muslim masses reposed faith in him. He will be remembered as the man who was responsible for the partition of India and the tragedy that overtook her after the partition. Dr. Moin Shakir contends that Jinnah was more interested in the political liberation of the Muslims than in the social and economic emancipation of the exploited masses. His "role was that of a sincere and clear-headed lawyer who could formulate and articulate in precise constitutional terms what his client really wanted." (Khilafat to Partition, p. 201).

Two-Nation Theory

While tracing the development of Muslim politics in India, one may

discover three distinct stages. Between 1906 and 1920, the All-India Muslim League tried to secure constitutional safeguards for the Indian Muslims as a religious minority in the form of separate electorates. Between 1921 and 1939, the Muslim League tried to secure the regional consolidation of the Muslim majorities within the frame-work of a loose federal Constitution. Between 1940 and 1947, the Muslim League demanded the creation of an independent state of Pakistan.

For the first time Iqbal redefined Muslim Communalism and proposed the idea of a separate Muslim state. According to him, the Indian Muslims were not a political minority but constituted a separate political nationality. They had no other option except either to demand full autonomy in the Muslim majority provinces within a very loose federal structure or to carve out a separate sovereign Muslim state. When Jinnah took up Iqbal's idea, he elaborated it into a coherent "two nations" theory on the basis of which the Muslim League made its demand for a separate Muslim state of Pakistan.

When Iqbal came back from Europe after higher studies in philosophy, in 1908, he was perturbed by the existing stagnation of Muslim thought. His knowledge of Nietzsche and his study of Rumi enabled him to come forth with his prescription for the malaise of the Muslims. He expounded his theory of Khudi (The Self) and Millat (The Community of Faith). In doing so, he totally rejected the Western ideas of nationality, nationalism and nationhood. He refuted the idea of a fatherland as the basis of modern politcal nationalism except Islam. He rejected the territorial foundations of modern nationalism and asserted that Islam was the only genuine principle for communal integration of mankind. He rejected the idea of the country as it divided humanity into warring nations and replaced it by the world-wide fellowship of Islam.

After rejecting modern theories of nationalism, Iqbal constructed his own theory of Islamic nationalism. According to him, the Islamic community (Millat) founded in the faith of the Oneness of God could be the only legitimate principle of integration among the Muslims. The faith of Islam provided an abiding spiritual bond which held together people of different colours, races, languages and other external manifestations of culture and transformed all of them into a universal community. Iqbal's Islamic universalism was a complete negation of any other principles of national integration such as race and common ancestry. To quote him, "Our hearts are bound to the beloved Prophet of Hajaz and to each other are we joined through him. Our common thread is simply loyalty to him alone." Iqbal declared to the Muslims of the world that it was only through a process of integration of the Self with the Community that they could regenerate the body politic of Islam to play its destined role in the history of mankind.

In 1930, Iqbal presented his mature political opinion on the political fate of the Indian Muslims in his Presidential address at the Allahabad annual Session of the All-India Muslim League. While outlining a course for political action for the Muslims of India, he put forward the idea of a separate single state for the Muslims in the North-Western region of India. To quote him, "I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-Government within the British Empire or without the British Empire, the forma-

tion of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim state appears to me the final destiny of the Muslims at least of North-West India."

In the course of his address, Iqbal observed, "It cannot be denied that *Islam,* regarded as an ethical ideal plus a certain kind of polity—by which expression I mean a social structure regulated by a legal system and animated by a specific ethical ideal—*has been the chief formative factor in the life-history of the Muslims of India.* It has furnished those basic emotions and loyalties which gradually unify scattered individuals and groups and finally transformed them into a well-defined people. Indeed it is no exaggeration to say that India is perhaps the only country where Islam, as a people-building force, is at its best."

In the opinion of Iqbal, the crux of the Indian problem was that the Hindu-Muslim conflict was a much deeper ideological cleavage. It was Islam versus nationalism. According to him, the construction of a polity on national lines was unthinkable.

The view of Iqbal was that communalism and nationalism were not mutually exclusive concepts. The Congress leaders were not willing to concede anything more than a minority status to the Muslim community in India. That status ultimately would have undermined the unique character of the Indian Muslims as a community in two ways. It would imply a complete break from the universal ummah. It would reduce the Indian Muslims to a religious minority. Iqbal defended Muslim communalism in these words: "And as far as I have been able to read the Muslim mind, I have no hesitation in declaring that if the principle that the Indian Muslim is entitled to full and free development on the lines of his own culture and tradition in his own Indian homelands is recognised as the basis of a permanent communal settlement, he will be ready to stake his all for the freedom of India. The principle that each group is entitled to free development on its own lines is not inspired by any feeling of narrow communalism. I entertain the highest respect for the customs, laws, religions and social institutions of other communities..Yet I love the communal group which is the source of my life and behaviour and which has formed me what I am by giving me its religion, its literature, its thought, its culture and thereby recreating its whole past as a living factor in my present consciousness." Again, "Communalism in its higher aspects then, is indispensable to the formation of a harmonious whole in a country like India."

Iqbal rejected both the Nehru Report and the Simon Commission Report as they did not satisfy him. According to him, a unitary form of Government is simply unthinkable in a self-governing India. The residuary powers must be left with the units and not with the federal Government. Iqbal was opposed to the inclusion of the Indian native states in the proposed federation under the Simon Commission scheme as that gave an over-whelming majority to the Hindus in an All-India Federal Assembly.

In his Presidential address, Iqbal referred to the serious mistakes which had been committed by the Muslim leaders in the past. According to him, the making of the Lucknow Pact was a mistake. It originated in a false view of Indian nationalism and deprived the Muslims of any chances of acquiring political power in India. The Lucknow Pact recognised the Indian Muslims merely as a religious minority. According to Iqbal, the problem of

India was international and not national. To quote him, "We are seventy millions and far more homogeneous than any other people in India. Indeed, the Muslims of India are the only people who can fitly be described as a nation in the modern sense of the word. The Hindus, though ahead of us in almost all respects, have not yet been able to achieve the kind of homogeneity which is necessary for a nation and which Islam has given you as a free gift. No doubt they are anxious to become a nation but the process of becoming a nation is a kind of travail, and in the case of Hindu India, involves a complete overhauling of her social structure."

While enunciating the theory that the Indian Muslims were truly a nation in the modern sense, Iqbal did not discard his original theory of the Muslim Millat. He simply gave it a new name—the Muslim nation. While doing so, he translated the idea of Muslim community into the vocabulary of modern political science as the true basis of Muslim nationalism.

Iqbal was opposed to the Government of the Unionist Party in the Punjab which had among its members the Muslims, the Hindus and the Sikhs. He realised the danger inherent in the Unionist dominated political scene in the Punjab. He would like to save the Punjabi Muslims from the clutches of the Unionist Party by breaking the Unionist Party and by integrating the solidly Muslim majority areas of the Punjab with the neighbouring Muslim majority provinces of Sind, Baluchistan and North-West Frontier Province. Perhaps, his proposal was based on the assumption that the idea of a Muslim nation in the North-West of India could never be reconciled with the notion of a single Indian nationhood. The view of Iqbal was that once the Indian segment of the Muslim Millat secured for itself a territorial consolidation in the North-West region of India, it would always be possible for it to forge further bonds of unity with the neighbouring Muslim states of Afghanistan, Iran, Turkey and the Arab countries. According to Iqbal, the establishment of a Muslim state in India was not an end in itself. It was a means to achieve a higher goal which was the consolidation of the Islamic community in the whole world. The contradiction between Iqbal's theory of the Islamic Millat and his proposal for the establishment of a consolidated Muslim state in the North-West Indian region was more apparent than real. In lending support to the two-nation theory, Iqbal was chiefly concerned with the consolidation of the Muslims in the North-West of India where they were in pre-dominant majority. He used the two-nation theory to counteract the viewpoint of the Indian nationalists that the people of India were a single nation in spite of their differences of religion and caste. Iqbal demanded the creation of a separate North-West Indian Muslim state on the basis of his theory of Muslim communalism.

Jinnah on Two-Nation Theory

In the early thirties, Iqbal's suggestion of a consolidated Muslim state in the North-West of India was not taken seriously by the Muslim leaders. However, he was successful in sharpening Muslim consciousness. During the Second Round Table Conference in 1931 in London, Iqbal and Jinnah had several occasions to discuss the future of the Indian Muslims. Jinnah is said to have realised the force of the arguments advanced earlier by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan and later by Dr. Iqbal against the dangers inherent in the functioning of a Westminster brand of representative Government in

India. Jinnah did not accept the claim of the Congress that it was the sole representative of the Indian nation and the Muslim League at best represented a Muslim minority and therefore could not be treated at par with the Congress. Jinnah decided to accept the suggestion of Iqbal that the Muslims must have a separate state of their own. Jinnah propounded his thesis that India was not a country but a continent. It was inhabited by many peoples, among whom the chief were the Hindus and the Muslims who constituted two distinct nations according to all prevalent standards. Hence, the Muslim nation in India was entitled to enjoy its right of self-determination. In expounding the two-nation theory, Jinnah transformed Iqbal's theory of Muslim communalism into Muslim nationalism. Iqbal's idea of communal autonomy was re-enunciated as the right of self-determination or national sovereignty.

In the course of his Presidential address at the Lahore Session of the All India Muslim League in March 1940, Jinnah declared, "The Mussalmans are not a minority. The British and particularly the Congress proceed on this basis, 'well, you are a minority after all, what do you want?' But surely Mussalmans are not a minority. We find that even according to the British map of India, we occupy large parts of this country where the Mussalmans are in a majority—such as Bengal, Punjab, N.W.F.P. and Baluchistan."

In explaining the idea of "Two-Nations", Jinnah was influenced by Dr. Iqbal and that becomes clear from the following passage from his speech: "It is extremely difficult to appreciate why our Hindu friends failed to understand the real nature of Islam and Hinduism. They are not religions in the strict sense of the word, but are, in fact, different and distinct social orders and it is a dream that the Hindus and Muslims can ever evolve a common nationality and this misconception of one Indian nation has gone far beyond the limits and is the cause of most of our troubles and will lead India to destruction if we fail to revise our notions in time. Hindus and Muslims belong to two different religious philosophies, social customs, literatures. They neither intermarry, nor interdine together and, indeed, they belong to two different civilizations which are based mainly on conflicting ideas and conceptions. Their aspects of life and on life are different. It is quite clear that Hindus and Mussalmans derive their inspiration from different sources of history. They have different epics, their heroes are different, and different episodes. Very often the hero of one is a foe of the other and, likewise, their victories and defeats overlap. To yoke together two such *nations* under a single state, one as a numerical minority and the other as a majority, must lead to growing discontent and final destruction of any fabric that may be built up for the government of such a state. . . . *Mussalmans are a nation according to any definition of a nation and they must have their homeland, their territory and their state.*"

The correspondence between Iqbal and Jinnah during 1936-1937 clearly shows that Iqbal was constantly impressing upon Jinnah the desirability and necessity of a separate state for the Muslims of India. In his letter dated 28 May, 1937, Iqbal wrote to Jinnah: "After a long and careful study of Islamic law, I have come to the conclusion that if this system of Law is properly understood and applied, at least the right to subsistence is secured to everybody. But the enforcement and development of the Shariat of Islam

is impossible in this country *without a free Muslim state or states.* This has been my honest conviction for many years and I still believe this to be the only way to solve the problem of bread for Muslims as well as to secure a peaceful India....But as I have said above, in order to make it possible for Muslim India to solve these problems, it is necessary *to redistribute the country* and *to provide one or more Muslim states with absolute majorities.* Don't you think that the time for such a demand has already arrived?"

In another letter of 21 June, 1937, Iqbal wrote to Jinnah: "In these circumstances it is obvious that the only way to a peaceful India is a *redistribution of the country* on the lines of racial religious and linguistic affinities....To my mind the new Constitution with its idea of a single Indian federation is completely hopeless. *A separate federation of Muslim provinces,* reformed on the lines I have suggested above, is the only course by which we can secure a peaceful India and save Muslims from the domination of Non-Muslims. Why should not the Muslims of North-West India and Bengal be considered as *nations* entitled to *self-determination* just as other nations in India and outside India are?"

Even earlier in 1938, the idea of two nations was asserted at the Sind Provincial Muslim League Conference at Karachi in the following resolution: "This conference considers it absolutely essential in the interest of an abiding peace of the vast Indian continent and in the interests of unhampered cultural development, the economic and social betterment, and *political self-determination of the two-nations known as Hindus and Muslims* to recommend to All-India Muslim League to review and revise the entire question of what should be the suitable constitution for India which will secure honourable and legitimate status due to them, and that this Conference, therefore, recommends to the All-India Muslim League to devise a scheme of Constitution under which *Muslims may attain full independence.*"

In pursuance of this policy, the famous Lahore resolution was adopted on 23 March, 1940. The resolution demanded that "Muslim India will not be satisfied unless the whole constitutional plan is considered de novo and that no revised plan would be acceptable to the Muslims unless it is framed with their approval and consent." The demand of the Muslim League was put forward in the following resolution: "Resolved that it is the considered view of this Session of the All-India Muslim League that no constitutional plan would be workable in this country or acceptable to the Muslims unless it is designed on the following basic principles, viz., that geographically contiguous units are demarcated into regions which should be so constituted with such territorial readjustments as may be necessary that the areas in which the Muslims are numerically in a majority as in the North-Western and Eastern Zones of India should be grouped to constitute 'Independent States in which the constituent units should be autonomous and sovereign.'

At the Madras Annual Session of the All India Muslim League held in 1941, Jinnah went a step further and asserted that in India there were not only two nations but more than two nations. He was referring to the people of Tamil Nadu. Jinnah was also sympathetic towards the Sikh claim for a Sikh state based on Sikh nationalism.

In his meetings with Mahatma Gandhi in 1944, Jinnah put forward the demand for Pakistan based on the theory of two nations. Regarding the two-nations theory, Mahatma Gandhi declared: "I find no parallel in history for a body of converts and their descendants claiming to be a nation apart from the parent stock. If India was one nation before the advent of Islam, it must remain one in spite of the change of faith of a very large body of her children." The reply of Jinnah was: "We maintain and hold that Muslims and Hindus are two major nations by any definition or test of a nation. We are a nation of a hundred million, and what is more, we are a nation with our own distinctive culture and civilization, language and literature, art and architecture, names and nomenclature, sense of values and proportion, legal laws and moral codes, customs and calendar, history and traditions, aptitudes and ambitions, in short, we have our own distinctive outlook on life and of life. By all canons of International Law, we are a nation."

In order to remove the loopholes in the Lahore Resolution of March 1940, the Legislators' Convention of the Muslim League held in Delhi on 9 April 1946 adopted a comprehensive resolution. The Lahore Resolution had not mentioned specifically the theory of two nations and hence the resolution of 9 April, 1946 provided thus: "Whereas different historical backgrounds, traditions, cultures, social and economic orders of the Hindus and the Muslims made impossible the evolution of a single nation inspired by common aspirations and ideals and whereas after centuries they still remain two distinct major nations". The Lahore Resolution had visualized the creation of independent states in the North-Western and North-Eastern regions and not the creation of a single Muslim state. The name Pakistan had not been mentioned in the Lahore resolution. The resolution of 9 April, 1946 stated thus: "That the zones comprising Bengal and Assam in the North-East and the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan in the North-West of India, namely Pakistan zones, where Muslims are a dominant majority, be constituted into a sovereign independent State and that an unequivocal understanding be given to implement the establishment of Pakistan without delay."

Dr. Moin Shakir writes that the two-nation theory and the demand for Pakistan was a self-defeating project and an escape from hard realities. No one denied that there are differences between the Hindus and the Muslims but the nature of the differences has been more religious than cultural. The defect of this theory is that it claims the Muslims as a separate nation only on religious ground. It does not take into account the large area of common life which the Hindus and Muslims quietly shared. The religious differences did not necessitate the creation of a separate nation state. The partition of the country was "neither inevitable nor was it necessarily inherent in Hindu-Muslim differences". Even in matters of religion, the differences were not so sharp and strong as they were generally made out to be. Besides, nationalism is more than a religion. It means "the corporate life of the people, derived from its customs, laws and institutions taken together". According to Dr. S. Ansari, the two-nation theory was not more than a myth. What was required was a change of heart wherein the goodwill of both the communities came into full play and made understanding possible. The Muslim League demanded Pakistan to preserve and promote the Muslim culture and

way of life, but partition was no solution of the problem. A complete exchange of population, between the two units was impracticable. A federal constitution distributing power between the States and Central Government and according full autonomy in the internal affairs of the units, might have solved the problem. The Pakistan scheme was not desirable because it meant a position of eternal orphanage for the Muslims in an Independent Hindu India. The solution of the Muslim problem in India was not partition but true federation—political as well as cultural. To quote Coupland, "Regionalism meets half the Muslim claim. It concedes the first demand of the Pakistan Resolution. It provides the Muslims with a national home which they call their own. They would be autonomous states, not secondary or subordinate units of administration." Even those who were opposed to the partition of the country, supported the idea of regional or provincial autonomy-. (Khilafat to Partition, pp. 197-199).

SUGGESTED READINGS

Ahsan, S.Q. : *Politics and Personalities in Pakistan*, Dacca, 1967.

Albiruni, A.H : *Makers of Pakistan and Modern Muslim India*, Lahore, 1950.

Ali, C.M. : *The Emergence of Pakistan*, London, 1967.

Ambedkar, B.R. : *Pakistan or Partition of India*, Bombay, 1946.

Ansari, S. : *Pakistan, the Problem of India*, Lahore, 1944.

Aziz, K.K. : *The Making of Pakistan*, London, 1967.

Beg, A.A. : *The Poet of the East*, Lahore, 1939.

Beni Prasad : *The Hindu-Muslim Question*, Allahabad, 1941.

Bilgrami, H.H. : *Glimpses of Iqbal's Mind and Thought*, Lahore, 1954.

Bolitho, Hector : *Jinnah, Creator of Pakistan*, New York, 1955.

Chagla, M.C. : *Roses in December*.

Chaudhari, B.R. : *Muslim Politics in India*, Calcutta, 1946.

Dar, B.A. : *A Study of Iqbal's Philosophy*, Lahore, 1944.

Duggal, M.R : *Jinnah : The Mufti-i-Azam*, Lahore, 1944.

Graham, G.F.I. : *Life of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan*, 1909.

Hafeez Malik (Ed.) : *Iqbal : Poet-Philosopher of Pakistan*, New York, 1971.

Haq, M.U. : *Muslim Politics in India* (1857-1947), Meerut, 1970.

Hodson, H.V. : *The Great Divide : Britain, India and Pakistan*, London, 1969.

Hussain, Abid : *Jinnah and League Politics*, Lucknow, 1940.

Ikram, S.M. : *Modern Muslim India and the Birth of Pakistan* (1858-1951), Lahore, 1970.

Iqbal, Mohammad : *Letters of Iqbal to Jinnah*, Lahore.

Iqbal, Mohammad :*The Development of Metaphysics in Persia*, Lahore, 1959.

Iqbal, Muhammad : *Kulliyat-i-Iqbal*, Lahore, 1973.

Iqbal, Muhmmad : *Rumuz-i-Bekhudi*, 1918.

Iqbal, Muhammad :*The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*, Lahore, 1968.

Iqbal, Muhammad : *Secrets of Self*, Lahore, 1941.

Jamil-ud-Din Ahmad (Ed.) : *Speeches and Writings of Mr. Jinnah*, Lahore, 1969.

Karandikar, M.A. : *Islam in India's Transition to Modernity*, Delhi, 1968.

Karunakaran, K.P. : *Modern Indian Political Tradition*, Bombay, 1962.

Karunakaran, K.P. : *Religion and Political Awakening in India*, Meerut, 1965.

Khan, Sir Syed Ahmad : *Causes of the Indian Revolt*, 1873.

Kiernan, V.G. : *Poems from Iqbal*, London, 1955.

Lal Bahadur : *The Muslim League*, Agra, 1954.
Majumdar, S.K. : *Jinnah and Gandhi*, Calcutta, 1966.
Malik, Hafeez : *Muslim Nationalism in India and Pakistan*, Washington, 1963.
Muhammad Ali : *My Life : A Fragment*, Lahore, 1942.
Muhammad Ali : *Select Writings and Speeches of Muhammad Ali.*
Naim, C.M. (Ed.) : *Iqbal, Jinnah and Pakistan : The Vision and the Reality*, Syracuse University, 1979.
Nizami, T.A. : *Muslim Political Thought and Activity in India*, Aligarh, 1969.
Philips, C.H. : *The Partition of India*, 1947.
Pirzada, S.D. (Ed.) : *Foundations of Pakistan : All India Muslim League Documents* (1906-47), 2 Vols., Karachi, 1970.
Qureshi, I.H. : *History of the Muslim Community in India*, New York, 1961.
Rizvi, S.A.A. : *Muslim Revivalist Movement in Northern India*, Lucknow, 1965.
Sarma, G.N. and Moin Shakir : *Politics and Society : Rammohan Roy to Nehru*, Aurangabad, 1983.
Sayeed, Khalid B. : *Pakistan : The Formative Phase* (1857-1948), London, 1968.
Shakir, Moin : *Khilafat to Partition*, New Delhi, 1983.
Shamloo : *Statements and Speeches of Iqbal.*
Sinha, S. : *Iqbal: The Poet and His Message*, Allabhabad, 1957.
Smith, W.C. : *Modern Islam in India*, Lahore, 1943.
Tariq, A.R. : *Speeches and Statements of Iqbal*, Lahore, 1973.
Vahid, S.A. : *Thoughts and Reflections of Iqbal*, Lahore, 1964.

CHAPTER XXI

Mahatma Gandhi (1869-1948)

In the words of Sir S. Radhakrishnan, "Gandhiji will ever be remembered as the great prophet of moral and spiritual revolution without which this distracted world will not find peace". Einstein said about Gandhiji that "generations to come will scarcely believe that such a one as this ever in flesh and blood walked upon this earth". Dr. Rajendra Prasad said, "Gandhi is dead but Gandhism will live till the stars shine and the oceans roll on". Gandhiji has been described as a prophet, a mystic, a saint, a theologian, a religious devotee, a moral preacher, a social reformer, non-violent revolutionary, a shrewd politician and a utopian. He has been rightly called the Father of the Nation. He was in every sense of the term the creator of modern India. It was under his leadership that India won her Independence.

His Life

The original name of Mahatma Gandhi was Mohandas Karmchand Gandhi. He was born on 2 October, 1969 at Porbandar in Kathiawar and was shot dead in New Delhi on 30 January, 1948 at the age of 79. He was sent to school at the age of seven but he was a mediocre student. He was married at the age of 12. He passed his Matriculation Examination in 1888. He went to England for qualifying himself for the Bar. Before going to England, he took a vow not to touch wine, women and meat in England and he kept his promise. He came back to India in 1891. He started as a lawyer but he did not meet with success. In the meanwhile, he got an assignment from Abdullah, a rich Gujarati merchant and he went to South Africa to conduct his case. That proved to be a turning point in his life. While in South Africa, he was shocked to find that the Indians were being very badly treated. He himself was treated shabbily by the Europeans. He took up the cause of the Indian settlers in South Africa and led an agitation against the Government. He himself and his followers had to suffer terribly at the hands of the Government and the European settlers in South Africa. He launched Satyagraha in South Africa a number of times between 1904 and July 1914. Before leaving South Africa in July 1914, he asked his countrymen there to be wide awake and continue to assert themselves for the betterment of their status. Gandhiji's stay in South Africa is regarded as the first phase of his public life.

The second phase of his public life was in India from 1915 to the achievement of Independence by India in August 1947. During this phase, Gandhiji set up his Ashram on 25 May, 1915 on the banks of the Sabarmati. He was very much impressed by Gokhale. He joined the Indian National Congress in 1916. He experimented with his weapon of Satyagraha in Champaran in Bihar, at Ahmedabad and in Kaira District in Gujarat. He

succeeded in getting the grievances of the peasants of Champaran removed. He also succeeded in getting raised the wages of the mill-workers of Ahmedabad who were on strike against the mill-owners on the question of higher wages. In the Kaira District, although the crops failed in 1918, the officers of the Government insisted on the collection of full land revenue. Gandhiji organised the peasants to offer Satyagraha and ultimately the Government made a settlement with the peasants.

These experiments in Satyagraha brought Gandhiji into close contact with the masses, the peasants in rural areas and workers in urban areas. Gandhiji was the only leader whose personal identification with the rural masses was total and complete. He fashioned his own personal life along ways familiar to the villagers and he spoke a language they could easily understand. He became the symbol of the poor and the down-trodden. He became a true representative of India.

When the Rowlatt Act was passed in the teeth of opposition from the people of India, Gandhiji decided to oppose it. He started a Satyagraha Sabha and ordered a general Hartal all over the country for 6 April 1919. Gandhiji was himself arrested when he was on his way to Delhi and was forcibly taken back to Bombay. He was a member of the Committee which investigated into the happenings in the Punjab during the Martial Law regime in 1919, particularly the Jallianwala Bagh tragedy. He was the leader of the Khilafat agitation started by the Muslims of India. One view is that his action was ill-advised and retrograde because it did not achieve Hindu-Muslim unity and for a time it introduced religion into politics. Another view is that the Khilafat movement provided an opportunity to convince the Muslims that the Hindus were equally concerned with the problems affecting the Muslims. The Khilafat movement brought the urban Muslims into the national movement. It was also responsible for the widespread enthusiasm and sense of involvement that prevailed among all sections of the people of India at that time.

In September 1920, a special session of the Congress was held at Calcutta. When Gandhiji proposed the boycott of Legislative Councils, he was opposed but ultimately his resolution was approved and confirmed. The Non-cooperation movement caught the imagination of the people who took part in large numbers. A complete boycott of foreign cloth was achieved by 30 September 1921. The Government resorted to repressive measures, but in spite of that the tempo of the movement continued to rise. There was violence at some places. After the Chauri Chaura incident, Mahatma Gandhi withdrew the Non-cooperation movement. He was convinced that if the Indians followed the path of violence, the armed power of the British Government was enough to destroy them. After the withdrawal of the movement, Gandhiji was arrested on 10 March, 1922 and was charged with the offence of spreading disaffection against the Government. He was tried at Ahmedabad but he pleaded guilty and made a lengthy statement in which he explained at length his own transformation from a loyal supporter and even an admirer of the British to an uncompromising critic and opponent of British rule in India. Gandhiji was sentenced to six years' imprisonment but was released earlier.

Gandhiji continued to dominate not only the Congress but also the entire politics of the country. His position was absolutely unchallenged.

In 1930, he started the Civil Disobedience movement but he was arrested for breaking the salt laws. The Civil Disobedience movement spread all over the country and lacs of people were arrested and imprisoned and heavy fines were not only imposed but also realised. The result was the signing of the Gandhi-Irwin Pact in March 1931. Mahatma Gandhi went to London to attend the Second Round Table Conference held in 1931. He came back empty-handed on account of the attitude of the British Government and M. A. Jinnah. On his return, he was arrested. There was a lot of repression in the country during 1932-33. The movement was withdrawn in April 1934.

Mahatma Gandhi continued to dominate the politics of India. Nothing was done without his consent and approval. In 1939, Subhas Chandra Bose tried to defy Mahatma Gandhi but he was forced to resign from the Congress presidentship. The Cripps proposals were rejected by Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress also rejected them. Gandhiji played an important part in the passing of the Quit India Resolution on 8 August, 1942. He demanded that he wanted Independence that very night. He was arrested and imprisoned alongwith the other members of the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress. Even from jail, he continued to vindicate the righteousness of his cause. He went on fast and the Government was forced to release him. He did not attend the Simla Conference summoned by Lord Wavell in 1945. He played his part during the negotiations with the Cabinet Mission in 1946. He was opposed to the partition of India but accepted it as his colleagues in the Congress accepted the same.

The third phase of his public career started in August 1947. While the other Indians celebrated the Independence day, Gandhiji was in Bengal trying to bring about Hindu-Muslim amity. He resorted to fast unto death in order to bring about communal hormony. He also insisted that a sum of Rs. 55 crores must be given to Pakistan. There was resentment against Gandhiji. On 30 January, 1948, he was shot dead.

Gandhiji was a man of action and thought. He was busy all the time in his mission. He dramatized his ideas by his articles, speeches, interviews, declarations and personal example. He not only dramatized his causes but also dramatized himself. While others held meetings of protest against the Rowlatt Bills, he called a Hartal or a general strike. While others walked out of the Assembly to show their defiance of authority, he walked miles to the sea in March 1930 to break the Salt Laws. The result was that he was able to concentrate the attention of his followers and countrymen on what he was doing. He was a great social reformer. He found the existing system of education defective and advocated the adoption of the Wardha scheme of education. He believed in Swadeshi. He put great emphasis on the establishment of cottage industries.

Percival Spear writes that Gandhi died for his faith and in dying, he created a nation. Sir Penderel Moon observes that Gandhiji did more than any one man to instil in the Hindus self-confidence, self-respect and a readiness to stand up for themselves. Romain Rolland writes that Gandhiji shook the British Empire and inaugurated the most powerful movement that the whole world has seen for nearly 2000 years. The view of Louis Fischer is that Gandhiji was the symbol of India's unanimous wish for freedom.

"He is not the man, he has no intention and never had to rule India or administer India. His function ends when he frees India".

Nature of the Political Thought of Gandhiji

The political thought of Gandhiji is "not a set of doctrines or dogmas, rules or regulations, injunctions or inhibitions, but it is a way of life. It indicates a new attitude or restates an old one towards life's issues and offers ancient solutions for modern problems." He never claimed that he had any cut and dry views. There was no rigidity about them. His whole life was an unending experiment. He named his Autobiography as "My Experiments with Truth". About his own philosophy, Gandhiji observed thus in 1936 : "There is no such thing as Gandhism and I do not want to leave any sect after me. I do not claim to have originated any new principle or doctrine. I have simply tried in my own way to apply the central truths to our daily life and problems. The opinions I have formed and conclusions I have arrived at are not final. I may change them tomorrow. I have nothing to teach to the world. Truth and non-violence are as old as the hills. All I have done is to try experiments in both on as vast a scale as I could do. In doing so, I have sometimes erred and learnt by my error. Well, all my philosophy, if it may be called by that pretentious name, is contained in what I have said. You will not call it Gandhism; there is no 'ism' about it."

Gandhiji did not give political philosophy in a systematic manner. He did not assign to himself the task of setting up an intellectual and academic discipline. He was not a theorist but a man of action. To quote him, "I am not built for academic writings. Action is my domain". Vinoba Bhave writes that some one suggested to Gandhiji that he should lay down his ideas in a systematic and formal treatise. The reply of Gandhiji was : "For one thing, I have no time; for another I am still experimenting. Hence let the treatise develop slowly of itself, if it does at all."

Gandhiji did not consider political philosophy as a distinct intellectual system separated from sociology, economics, ethics etc. He viewed life in its totality. He did not draw any line of demarcation between economics and ethics, ethics and politics, politics and economics etc. He continued to make experiments all his life and changed his views from time to time according to circumstances and also what he considered to be true and valid in a view situation. Gandhiji tried to solve problems as they arose. His thinking grew out of practice. To quote Louis Fischer, "He allowed truth to lead him without a map. If it took him to an area where he had to discard some intellectual baggage or walk alone without past associates, he went. He never impeded his mind with STOP signs." Gandhiji did not always appear to be consistent. To quote him, "I am not at all concerned with appearing to be consistent. In my pursuit after truth I have discarded many ideas and learnt many new things. Old as I am in age, I have no feeling that I have ceased to grow inwardly or that my growth will stop with the dissolution of the flesh. I have never made a fetish of consistency. I am a votary of truth and I must say what I feel and think at a given moment on the question, without regard to what I may have said before on it. As my vision gets clearer, my views must grow clearer with daily practice. Where I have deliberately altered an opinion, the change should be obvious. Only

a careful eye would notice a gradual and imperceptible evolution." About his growing experience, Gandhiji said, "At the time of writing I never think of what I have said before. My aim is not to be consistent with my previous statements on a given question but to be consistent with truth as it may present itself to me at a given moment. The result has been that I have grown from truth to truth; I have saved my memory an undue strain; and what is more, whenever I have been obliged to compare my writing even of fifty years ago with the latest, I have discovered no inconsistency between the two. But friends who observe inconsistency will do well to take the meaning that my latest writing may yield, unless, of course, they prefer the old. But before making the choice they should try to see if there is not an underlying or abiding consistency between the two seeming inconsistencies." Again, "People say that I have changed my view, that I say today something different from what I said years ago. The fact of the matter is that conditions have changed. I am the same. My words and deeds are dictated by prevailing conditions. There has been a gradual evolution in my environment and I react to it as a Satyagrahi."

Gandhiji believed in the unity of human life which cannot be divided into separate, water-tight compartments—religious, moral, political, economic, social, individual and collective. All these seemingly separate segments are different facets of man's life. They act and react upon one another. In reality, there can be no problems that are purely moral, economic, political, social, individual or collective. They are inextricably inter-linked.

Gandhiji's own life was lived in conformity with certain basic principles and was therefore integrated and coordinated. It made an harmonious whole. His teachings and schemes of reform reflect the same integration and coordination. There is a basic unity of purpose and aim. This unity is not always apparent to a superficial student of his life and his speeches and writings. The elements of the unity are there, but they have not been reduced to a system. Gandhiji himself never attempted a systematisation of his thought. He was content to act in a given situation and solve life's problems as they arose and presented themselves to him, in the light of his basic moral principles. He left the task of logic ordering and systematisation to others. The solutions he offered to the problems confronting him, his country and even the world, were practical and often coloured by the time and circumstances in which they arose.

Gandhiji was not an intellectual in the academic sense of the term. He was not a scholar or a philoospher. He was not a theoretician. His thinking had the quality of a creative genius and not that of a student. He was pre-eminenly a man of action. He has written a great deal but his writings were designed as a guide to action and not for the acquisition of knowledge. They were generally concerned with the solution of his actual problems, arising out of the many-sided and complex situations of his time. The discussion of theory is always brief and sketchy. As soon as Gandhiji had an idea or plan, he tried to put it into practice and induced others to do the same. In the latter case, he had naturally to explain his ideas and plans. But the explanations were brief and suited to the person, place and occasion. The guidance given was practical. Generally, the instructions and explanations were conveyed through correspondence, newspaper articles or brought out in committee discussions and speeches. Gandhiji wrote a

few books and even those were concerned with particular problems. They were not written with the object of explaining his system of thought rationally and logically argued in all its implications. The writings were generally free from references to other thinkers and authors. For popularising his ideas and converting the people to his way of thinking and action, Gandhiji, as a practical reformer, relied more on example than on precept or preaching. The result is that from the point of view of theory, there are not only gaps which need filling but also apparent contradictions that need to be reconciled in the light of his thought as a whole.

Whatever their external form of presentation and expression, the ideas of Gandhiji were new and revolutionary. They arose out of the creative mind of an individual to whose reforming zeal the social situation and the difficulties of those times were a challenge. For him, historical precedents and examples were no barrier to fresh thinking and discovery. Gandhiji did not acquire his ideas and knowledge merely from books. He did not pass his time in libraries. Much of his knowledge was the result of direct contact with life and the practical experience it offered. He placed his ideas before the public not in the language of the learned but in that of the average intelligent man and woman. In explaining them, he did not use the philosophic and technical language of the schools. He was a man of the masses and spoke to them in their own simple language. He addressed them not about what he had read and studied in books but what he had seen, sensed, experienced and thought about. He described his own observations and reactions to them.

Gandhiji did not follow the method of proving his propositions. While placing before the nation the programme of Khadi and village industry, he did not systematically work out all the implications of his scheme in the language of the economists. He did not write a learned thesis to prove the need for and value of decentralised industry in the economy of India. He did not discuss such profound questions as value, cost of production, demand and supply etc. He merely gave simple and homely reasons and examples for his new and revolutionary ideas. He talked of the poverty of the masses and their enforced idleness. He emphasised the fact that real India lived in her villages. The idea of labour-using as opposed to labour-saving techniques was not worked out in appropriate technical terms.

If the economic implications of cottage industry were not systematically worked out in technical language, its political implications received even less attention. Gandhiji talked of Swaraj in terms of the Charkha and Khadi, but the connection was not brought out in an appropriate dissertation on the subject. No thesis was presented for discussion. No seminar or study circles were organised. The relation between the Charkha and political freedom of India appeared remote and far fetched. However, it is quite possible to show the connection between the two. Gandhiji could have elaborated the idea of the economic organisation of the country on the basis of a voluntary cooperative effort beginning with Khadi and progressively including other fields of economic and industrial life of the nation. This vast organising capacity and experience it afforded could be translated into political terms of purpose, direction, discipline, self-sacrifice, recognition of social obligations, obedience to a leader etc. All these qualities could be proved to be necessary for dislodging the foreign rule and re-arranging the

life of the country after independence on an egalitarian pattern. It could be shown that no national movement had ever succeeded without the acquisition of qualities inherent in the organisation of the Khadi and cottage and village industries. At every step of the argument, appropriate historical parallels could be quoted. All this was not done by Gandhiji. This is not because he could not do so as all the relevant arguments lie scattered in his speeches and writings. As a practical reformer, he had not the time to work in libraries and museums. He had to think even as he was acting and guiding a revolutionary movement.

Gandhiji discussed economic and practical problems from a higher moral and humanistic point of view. If a youngman wants to study the economic and political ideas of Gandhiji, he has not to content himself with their meagre systematic literature on those subjects. He has to wade through a mass of material which he must arrange and systematise for himself. The ideas of Gandhiji have to be coordinated and co-related. The trends in his thinking on many subjects dealt with by him are scattered throughout his writings. They have to be arranged and presented in a systematic form.

Gandhiji was a reformer and he was concerned with many complicated problems of life. Sometimes one aspect received emphasis, at other times another. It all depended upon time, place, his audience and what needed emphasis for the time being. Such synthetic thought does not conform easily to a rigid system. It bases itself upon the moving facts of life and on the creative, dynamic and revolutionary thought of the guide or the leader. Judged by any other standard, it presents logical inconsistencies and contradictions. Synthetic thought is liable to many-sided interpretations. It is also liable to mis-interpretation by over-emphasis or neglect of some of its many facets.

Gandhiji sought to synthesise the material and spiritual and individual and collective life of man. Therefore, he had to deal with both the sets. As occasion demanded he emphasised the one or the other. He often said that he could "carry God to the poor in a bowl of rice". It is easy to misunderstand and misinterpret him by focussing attention and emphasis on one side and ignoring the rest of his thought and thus distorting and perverting his meaning and intention. Gandhiji has been attacked both by the spiritualists and materialists. The former have accused him of lowering the purity of spiritual life by mixing it wth economics and politics. The Socialists and Communists have often charged Gandhiji with confusing economic and political issues with his ideas of truth and non-violence and his philosophy of means and ends. People could not and do not understand Gandhiji's insistence on spiritual values. They think that the questions of political freedom and economic equality are the supreme issues and public attention must not be diverted from them to moral problems which are irrelevant. They argue that nobody has the right to sacrifice the economic and political interests of the masses to considerations of morality. Individuals may have the right, and under certain circumstances even the duty, to sacrifice their personal interests to achieve moral ends, but a nation has no right to sacrifice its material interests for moral ends. Such critics do not see that Gandhiji never sacrificed what he considered to be the true interests of the country or of the masses. He did not see those interests narrowly. He saw no inherent conflict between a country's

real political and material interests and the fundamentals of morality. He thought that neither individuals nor groups can dispense with moral considerations. The moral decay of a people has always preceded their physical and material degeneration.

Gandhiji's advocacy of decentralised industry is made out to be opposition to all centralised industry. It is said that he was against all scientific knowledge and discovery because he advocated the pre-eminence of human values over mere physical conquest of nature and the multiplication of material wants and goods. As Gandhiji advocated education through purposeful activity, he is supposed to be against all intellectual knowledge. His critics do not understand that what Gandhiji aims at is deeper and fuller intellectual knowledge which can be acquired best through cooperative work and experience.

Many critics point out inconsistencies by giving isolated quotations from his writings and speeches, but Gandhiji did not see contradictions in them on account of his constructive genius and synthetic attitude towards life. He saw no conflict between the interests of the Hindus and Muslims and national good and international good. The narrow nationalists denounced his humanism as surrender of national interest. The intellectual internationalists accused him of narrow and aggressive nationalism. However, Gandhiji was a true nationalist and an internationalist. If proper justice is to be done to Gandhiji's thought, it must be considered in its entirety and in its proper setting in Indian conditions of the time and the problems he had to solve. The local and temporal over-emphasis, wherever it exists, has to be toned down to bring out the proper relation of the parts to the whole scheme of his thought and philosophy. Any point or points under-emphasised must be clearly brought out. Sometimes gaps must be filled to make the thought and the expression consistent with the whole scheme. The local colour has to be toned down to bring out a universal principle. Above all, the whole thought has to be co-related to Gandhiji's own conduct in life.

The personality of Gandhiji continued to grow unceasingly. It is this continuous evolution that invested him with perpetual youth. Times change and alongwith them ideas, ideals and modes of thought and action. The greatest difficulty of age is to keep abreast of the times and understand the young and appreciate and sympathise with their new ways, dreams and aspirations. Gandhiji somehow always kept himself upto date. So far as fundamentals go, he was ahead of his time. This came out in bold relief at the time of the Quit India movement. This was something that took the bravest and most impetuous among his companions by surprise. The cautious advocate of individual civil disobedience who was criticised for his halting policy, all of a sudden cast aside all hesitation and brushed aside counsel of prudence. He flung himself and his country into a movement which took away the breath of the hottest, the most ardent revolutionaries in the country. This became possible because some of his fundamental ideas were very much ahead of his time. They appeared to be Utopian but he worked them in such a way that they became practical and yielded tangible results.

Gandhiji was like a creative artist. An artist keeps young as long as creative genius lasts and Gandhiji was creative upto the last. When in 1944,

he came out of jail owing to his serious illness, he told his followers that he was not yet finished and he would give one more battle to the British before he had gone.

His concept of non-violence went through an evolutionary process. During World War I, he advised the peopple to help the British war-efforts. During World War II, his attitude towards war was different from the very beginning. He was not prepared to associate himself with war in any capacity. This was due not merely to the fact that his attitude towards British rule in India had changed, but also because his concept of non-violence had undergone evolutionary growth.

The thought of Gandhiji must be judged and evaluated on its own merits and not always on Gandhiji's arguments. A student of his thought must not content himself with his reasoning and his style or the words and expressions used by him. Like every great reformer, his thought was greater than his words and arguments. Often his conduct was more revealing and eloquent than the arguments advanced by him for a particular course of action. Gandhiji's public and private life was an open book and his writings must be studied alongwith it. His writings alone may not bring out the full implications of his philosophy of life, individual and social.

Various Influences on Gandhiji

The most important influence on the thinking of Gandhiji was that of the Gita which he read in 1889 and which remained his constant companion for the rest of his life. He himself wrote thus : "When doubts surround me, when disappointments stare me in the face and I see not one ray of light on the horizon, I turn to the Bhagavad Gita and find a verse to comfort me and I immediately begin to smile in the midst of overwhelming sorrow. My life has been full of external tragedies and if they have not left any visible effect on me, I owe it to the teachings of Bhagavad Gita".

Gandhiji was also influenced by the Jain monk Becharji Swami who helped him to go to England for his studies. Before Gandhiji went to England for studies, the Swami administered to him an oath and he took three vows not to touch wine, women or meat. Buddhism also influenced Gandhiji.

John Ruskin's book entitled "Unto This Last" had also an enormous influence on the life of Gandhiji. This book was given to him by S. L. Polak and after its study, Gandhiji decided to change his own life in accordance with the ideals of that book. Gandhiji writes, "That book marked a turning point in my life." Gandhiji learnt three lessons from that book : (1) That economy is good which is conducive to the good of all. (2) The work of a lawyer has the same value as that of a barber. (3) The life of labour is the life worth living.

Gandhiji was in prison in 1908 when he read Thoreau's "Essay on Civil Disobedence". It is contended that Gandhiji got his idea of the Satyagraha from Thoreau, but Gandhiji denied this in 1935 in these words : "The statement that I have derived my idea of Civil Disobedience from the writings of Thoreau is wrong. The resistance to authoirty in South Africa was well advanced before I got the Essay of Thoreau on Civil

Disobedience." However, Gandhiji admitted that his study of the writings of Thoreau left a deep impression on him.

Gandhiji was also influenced by Tolstoy, particularly his book entitled "The Kingdom of God is Within You". Gandhiji himself admitted that "its reading cured me of my scepticism and made me a firm believer in Ahimsa." In a letter to Tolstoy written in April 1910, Gandhiji described himself as a humble follower of Tolstoy. In a letter addressed to Gandhiji, Tolstoy observed, "I just received your letter and your book 'Indian Home Rule.' I read your book with great interest because of the things and questions you treat in it; passive resistance is a question of the greatest importance, not only for India but for the whole of humanity." Gandhiji is stated to have remarked that "Tolstoy is one of the three moderners who have exerted the greatest spiritual influence on my life."

There is a striking similarity between the philosophies of Tolstoy and Gandhiji. Both of them denounced modern civilization as based on force and exploitation. Both of them were opposed to violent methods of fighting evil. Both put emphasis on the reform of the individual and preached extreme simplicity of life, bread-labour and virtual celibacy.

However, they also differed in certain respects. Gandhiji was far more practical than Tolstoy. He was always ready to adapt his actions to the demands of the changing world. His conception of non-violence was slightly different from that of Tolstoy. The view of Tolstoy was that non-violence implied the avoidance of force in all its forms, but Gandhiji put emphasis on motive and defended non-violence as the avoidance of injury or pain to any creature out of anger or from a selfish motive. Tolstoy turned away from life because it involved some form of violence but Gandhiji followed the idea of the Gita which stands for action without attachment.

Rajchandra, a distinguished reformer of Bombay, also exercised a lot of influence on the life of Gandhiji. After his return from England after finishing his studies, Gandhiji came into intimate touch with him. He created in Gandhiji a keenness for the study of Hindu scriptures.

The Yogsutra of Patanjali, the Ramayana and the Mahabharata also exercised great influence on his mind. From the Upanishads, he derived inspiration for his faith in non-possession.

"Sermon on the Mount" had a great influence on Gandhiji. He always remembered such sayings as "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you", "Do good to them who hate you and pray for them that despitefully abuse you and persecute you", "If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; if he is thirsty, give him water to drink", "Overcome evil by good", "If a man smite thee on one cheek, turn to him the other also" etc. The view of Rev. Doke is that the Sermon on the Mount awakened Gandhiji to the righteousness and value of Satyagraha. Gandhiji discovered an example of non-violent resistance from the following words of Christ uttered by him at the time of his crucifixion : "Fther forgive them for they know not what they do".

The teachings of Lao-Tse and Confucius also affected the political and

moral thinking of Gandhiji. The philosophy of non-assertiveness of Lao-Tse deeply influenced him. The view of Confucius that "men should not do to others what they would not have done to them" also affected the thinking of Gandhiji.

The Theosophists revealed to him the value of the spiritual heritage of India. The writings of Arnold viz., The Song Celestial and the Light of Asia also influenced Gandhiji.

Gandhiji was also influenced by Tilak and Gokhale. He owed to Tilak the attitude of confrontation with British bureaucracy and sacrifice and suffering for the freedom of the country. Like Tilak, Gandhiji used religion for political purposes.

Gandhiji declared that Gokhale was his political Guru. He derived the notion of spiritualization of politics from him. His theory of means and ends was mostly taken from the teachings of Gokhale. Gokhale taught that the means to be employed should be peaceful and legitimate and those alone could lead to real progress. Gokhale and Gandhiji excluded narrowness, sectarianism and dogmatism from religion. If Hinduism consisted of doing injustice to the Muslims, Gokhale declared that he was not a Hindu. The Dharma of Gandhiji transcended Hinduism, Christianity and Islam although it maintained essential links with Hinduism.

Religion and Politics

Gandhiji was not prepared to separate religion from politics. To quote him, "Those who say that religion has nothing to do with politics, do not know what religion means." Again, "He does not know what patriotism or feeling for one's country is who does not know true duty or religion." "If I take part in politics, it is only because politics today encircles us like the coils of the snake from which one cannot get out, no matter how one tries. I wish to wrestle with the snake. I am trying to introduce religion into politics." There are no politics devoid of religion. Politics bereft of religion are a death-trap because they kill the soul." "At the back of every word that I have uttered since I have known what public life is and of every act that I have done, there has been a religious consciousness and a down-right religious motive." "My motive has been purely religious. I could not be leading a religious life unless I identify myself with the whole of mankind, and this I could not do unless I took part in politics. The full gamut of man's activities today constitutes an indivisible whole. You cannot divide social, political and religious work into water-tight compartments. I do not know any religion apart from human activity. It provides a moral basis to all other activities which if they would otherwise lack reduce life to a thing of sound and fury signifying nothing."

Religion was the very breath of Gandhiji's life. He was a seeker after truth and his God manifested Himself in Truth and Love. Love and Ahimsa had the same meaning for him. Without Ahimsa truth could not be found. Gandhiji wanted to moralise man and society and he found it difficult to separate politics from religion. His contention was that there could not be two consciences of man, one individual and social and the other political. The same code of morality had to be observed in all spheres of human activity. To quote him, "We have to make truth and non-vio-

lence matters not merely for individual practice, but for practice by groups, communities and nations. That at any rate is my dream." Again, "I do not believe that the spiritual law works in a field of its own. On the contrary, it expresses itself from the ordinary activities of life. It does affect the economic, social and political fields."

Romain Rolland writes, "To understand Gandhiji's activity, it should be realised that his doctrine is like a huge edifice composed of two different floors or grades. Below is the solid ground-work, the basic foundation of religion. On this vast and unshakable foundation is based the political and social campaign".

Religion was the basis of the politics of Gandhiji. He neither preached nor believed in the theocratic dogmatism. He did not believe in "the mingling of the sphere of Caesar and the sphere of Christ." He did not ask people to go back to the primitive times. He stood for a life of strenuous, dynamic, morally-oriented activity which involves the quest of the good of one's soul and mankind and the eradication of wrong and injustice.

For Gandhiji, religion and morality were the same. They were interchangeable terms. Gandhiji himself said that though he wore the guise of a politician, at heart, he was a religious man. Gandhiji became a political leader by necessity. It is the force of circumstances which drove him into politics.

Means and End

Gandhiji made no distinction between means and end. To quote him, "Means and end are convertible terms in my philosophy of life. They say 'means are after all means.' I would say that 'means are after all everything.' As the means, so the end. There is no wall of separation between means and end. Indeed the Creator has given us control (and that too very limited) over means, none over the end." Again, "The means may be likened to a seed, the end to a tree. and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as between the seed and the tree."

The view of Gandhiji was that not only the end should be high and laudable, the means should also be moral. However, this does not mean that Gandhiji did not attach importance to the end. He put equal emphasis on both. The means must be as pure as the end. With regard to the means, we must take our stand on the firm and solid ground of unadulterated good. Gandhiji's effort to give concrete expression in the form of Satyagraha to the principle of moral approximation of the end to the means, is the most unique contribution of our times to the philosophy and technique of revolution.

Relating means to ends is the greatest contribution of Gandhiji to political theory. Alexander Horace writes, "To the world as whole, Gandhiji stands as the prophetic voice of his generation indeed of this century who consistently advocated non-violent action as the right means to use in combating every injustice, for righting every wrong". (Gandhi Through Western Eyes, p. 182).

Gandhiji did not approve of the view that the end justifies the means.

He was very particular that moral means must be employed to win the freedom of the country and not fraud or violence. The stand taken by Gandhiji was absolutely different from what was being followed by politicians in general and the Communists and Fascists in particular. To these people the end justifies the means. The means employed may be good or bad, what matters is whether the end has been achieved or not. Gandhiji was opposed to the artificial division of an act into two parts, means and ends. He believed that the means and ends were inseparable and constituted an organic whole.

Gandhiji was opposed to the use of force for the attainment of Swaraj. His view was that Swaraj will lose its charm and utility if it is achieved after a bloodbath. That is the reason why he resorted to the technique of Satyagraha to achieve independence for his country. Dr. G. N. Dhawan writes about Gandhiji, "His effort to give concrete expression in the form of Satyagraha to this principle of moral approximation of the end and the means is perhaps the most unique contribution of our times to the philosophy and technique of revolution."

It is rightly pointed out that the present degeneration of humanity and crisis of character is due to the immorality of the means adopted by the parties concerned.

Non-Violence

The view of Gandhiji is that non-violence or Ahimsa is the heart of all religions. Ahimsa is truth itself, its very soul and its maturest fruit. Truth and Ahimsa are two sides of a smooth, unstamped, metallic disc and are so intertwined that it is difficult to disengage and separate them. Gandhiji put more emphasis on truth than on Ahimsa because he believed that truth existed beyond and unconditioned by space and time, but Ahimsa existed only on the part of all finite beings. Ahimsa divorced from truth would be demoralising. Gandhiji was prepared to sacrifice Ahimsa for the sake of truth and not vice-versa. "The jewel of non-violence was discovered during the search for and contemplation of truth".

Gandhiji referred to three levels of non-violence. (1) The highest form was what he called the enlightened non-violence of resourcefulness or the non-violence of the brave. It was the non-violence of one who adopted it not by painful necessity but by inner conviction based on moral consideration. This non-violence was not merely political but pervaded every sphere of life. It was non-violence without any mental reservation. It was such non-violence that moved mountains and transformed life.

(2) The second kind of non-violence was adopted as a measure of expediency and sound policy in some sphere of life. It was weakness rather than moral conviction which ruled out the use of violence. If pursued honestly and scrupulously with real courage so long as it is accepted as a policy, it is capable of achieving results to a certain extent. However, it is not as effective as a non-violence of the brave. It is not based on any conviction but on expediency and consequently permits the use of violence where necessary.

According to Gandhiji, non-violence presuppposes the ability, though not the willingness, to strike. To quote him, "Man for man, the strength

of non-violence is in exact proportion to the ability, not the will, of the non-violent person to inflict violence." Non-violence is the quality of the brave and strong and is not possible without fearlessness.

(3) The third kind of non-violence was the passive violence of the coward and the effiminate. According to Gandhiji, "Cowards and Ahimsa do not go together any more than water and fire." A coward runs away from danger instead of facing it. It is unmanly, unnatural and dishonourable. The non-violence of the coward is really violence in suspension or inactive violence. If a choice was to be made between violence and cowardice, Gandhi would have preferred violence. To him, vengeance was superior to passive and helpless submission. To quote him, "It is better to be violent if there is violence in our breast than to put on the cloak of non-violence to cover impotence." Again, "There is hope for a violent man to be some day non-violent but there is none for a coward. I have, therefore, said more than once that if we do not know how to defend ourselves, our women and our places of worship by force of suffering, i.e., by non-violence, we must, if we are men, be at least able to defend all these by fighting."

There is nothing like failure in non-violence as there is nothing like success in violence. Non-violence is not a cloistered virtue, confined only to the hermit and the cavedweller. Being soul-force, it is capable of being practised equally by all. Even the masses can practise non-violence, "not with full knowledge of its implications but because it is the law of our species."

Gandhiji gave a very wide meaning to non-violence. It meant avoiding injury to anything on earth in thought, word or deed. Even a harsh speech is a kind of violence. It is also violence to think bad of others. A non-violent person does not consider any one his enemy and hence has no ill-will.

Gandhiji compared non-violence with violence in these words: "Non-violence is the law of our species as violence is the law of brute. The spirit lies dormant in the brute and he knows no law but that of physical force. The dignity of man requires obedience to a higher law—the struggle of the spirit. Non-violence is a perfect state. It is the goal towards which all mankind moves naturally, though unconsciously".

According to Gandhiji, non-violence "is a soul force or truth force or truth-seeking force. It is in short Satyagraha which means resistance to evil with the moral and spiritual force that a person can command. It is the use of moral force or firmness in the vindication of truth." It is the soul-force or the power of the God-head. It shows conscious suffering, utter selflessness and universal law.

According to Gandhiji, non-violence is not a negative force. It is a force which is more positive than electricity and more powerful than even ether. Non-violence is a positive procedure for promoting worthwhile social change. Sometimes violence is not wrong. This is when one is confronted with a choice between doing so and acting in a cowardly manner. Gandhiji blessed the aircrafts which bombarded the Pakistani raiders who had invaded Kashmir. On that occasion, Gandhiji said that "it is better to be a soldier than to be a coward".

Gandhiji described non-violence as "a weapon of matchless potency." His view was that the highest violence could be met by the highest non-violence. Non-violence is a "bravery of the soul".

Gandhiji referred to certain *requisites of non-violence.* Those were truth, inner purity, fasting, fearlessness, non-possession and perseverance. (a) Gandhiji put great emphasis on *truth* as the basic factor of non-violence. Gandhiji's view was that not only God is truth but truth also is God. "For me, truth is the sovereign principle which includes numerous other principles. This truth is not only truthfulness in word but truthfulness in thought also and not only the relative truth of our conception, but the Absolute Truth, the Eternal Principle, that is God". A believer in non-violence is not to shirk from telling the truth on account of the fear of the consequences. Alexander Horace writes, "Truth and non-violence have been the watchwords emblazoned on the Gandhian banner throughout his public career".

Gandhiji regarded truth as the supreme value in ethics, politics and religion and the ultimate source of authority. He declared that morality is the basis of things and truth is the substance of all morality. According to Gandhiji, "Nothing exists in reality except truth, everything else is illusion". Again, "Truth alone exists and if there is God, truth must be God."

Gandhiji wanted us to have faith in absolute truth which we can imagine but cannot attain. According to him, there is nothing wrong in every man following truth according to his lights. The path of truth is straight. It is like balancing oneself on the edge of sword and one can fall down if one is a little inattentive. Truth is at once intellectual and moral in nature. It involves the perfection of the knower, both in thought and deed. The significance of the distinction between absolute and relative truth lies in the acceptance of the need for a corrective process of experimentation with one's own experiences. This shows our readiness to admit our errors openly and to learn from them. A man of truth must ever be confident and diffident. He should be confident in his devotion to truth and diffident on account of his consciousness of his fallibility.

Gandhiji was aware of the constant struggle between truth and falsehood. He used truth in several senses. He believed that there could be no compromise with error though there must be compromise and reconciliation between relative truths. Error ceases to be error when corrected. To quote Gandhiji, "The seeker of Truth must have a heart tender as the lotus and hard as granite".

Gandhiji agreed that his highly exalted and exacting conception of truth could be comprehended and practised only by a few, but he contended that his was the only way in which man could realise absolute truth. The person who keeps back the truth or withholds it from motives of expediency is either a coward or a criminal or both. The exacting vow of truth can be taken only by a few such as saints.

According to Gandhiji, one must practise truth not only because it leads to eventual victory but also because it is essential for survival. Untruth is founded in fear and insecurity and no person can be really happy or stable in such a state. A man who is God-fearing cannot be afraid of any man.

(b) A person who wants to follow the path of non-violence must cultivate *inner purity*. He must prepare himself for non-violence by self-discipline, civility and inner purity. To quote Gandhiji, "Chastity is one of the greatest disciplines without which the mind cannot attain requisite firmness." Non-violence begins and ends by turning the searchlight inward.

(c) *Fast* also helps a non-violent person. Fasting is an agent of self-purification. To quote Gandhiji, "A genuine fast cleanses the body, mind and soul. It crucifies the flesh and to the extent sets the soul free." Gandhiji himself made use of the weapon of fasting on many occasions. In September 1932, he resorted to fast unto death against the Communal Award issued in August 1932. On that occasion, Gandhiji wrote, "Fasting stirs up sluggish consciences and fires loving hearts to action. Non-violent pressure exerted through self-suffering by fasting touches and strengthens the moral fibre of those against whom it is directed."

(d) Another requisite of non-violence is *fearlessness*. Gandhiji wanted a non-violent soldier to develop in himself moral courage and strength. On 27 November 1946, Gandhiji said, "The only guarantee is to be sought in the personal courage of individuals. Everything else depends on it." Ahimsa means absolute fearlessness. It is the strongest and the subtlest force. Cowardice is to be shunned by a non-violent soldier. To quote Gandhiji, "Cowardice itself is violence of a subtle and therefore dangerous type and far more difficult to eradicate than the habit of physical violence. A coward never risks his life. A man who would kill often risks it. A non-violent person's life is always at the disposal of him who would take it. For he knows that soul within himself never dies. The more a man gives his life, the more he saves it. Thus non-violence requires more than the courage of the soldier of war".

(e) A non-violent soldier is expected to develop an *attitude of non-attachment* in the material things of life. "So many of the so-called comforts of life are not only not indispensable but positive hindrances to the elevation of mankind."

(f) An advocate of non-violence and a believer in non-violence should cultivate the *virtues of patience and perseverance*. They must keep in mind the fact that non-violence does not yield fruits so quickly as violence does. Violence does bring quick results but those are neither stable nor lasting. A policy of non-violence can be successful only if it is followed with patience and perseverance.

The policy of non-violence can be followed by a nation to defend itself against external aggression or internal disruption. Adequate preparations should be made for defending the country under the scheme of non-violence. The social relations within the community must be changed by means of constructive work. The non-violent band of Satyagrahis should talk to the people on the other side even if they are killed while doing so. They must have patience while doing so. Such sacrifice on the part of Satyagrahis may not be noticed. The Satyagrahis may be killed by tanks or bombs or otherwise but they must persist in their efforts. When the enemy has won and takes possession of the land of the Satyagrahis, the Satyagrahis should organise non-violent, non-cooperation with the enemy forces. The Satyagrahis should confront the aggressors, talk to them, tell them that they were prepared to share

whatever they had if the soldiers were prepared to share the building up of a new kind of life based on justice and equality. The Satyagrahis must not submit to the dictates of the aggressors or work as their slaves. Gandhiji did not advocate scorched earth policy. After the sacrifice of the first line of Satyagrahis, the other Satyagrahis should continue their non-violent non-cooperation. In course of time, the imagination of the occupation forces would be touched and they would begin to wonder at the quiet courage and determination of those who never threatened their lives yet would not surrender but carry on another way of life in which all men were treated as brothers. Gandhiji was convinced that self-suffering on the part of Satyagrahis was bound to melt the heart of the aggressors and evoke respect for their courage and selflessness.

Gandhiji admitted that the heart of a ferocious dictator like Hitler may not be touched but Hitler alone was not fighting. The soldiers who were fighting under him were bound to be affected by the sufferings of the Satyagrahis.

Satyagraha

Gandhiji coined and used the word Satyagraha in 1906 to express the nature of the non-violent action undertaken by the Indians in South Africa against the racist Government there. With the passage of time and with his involvement in the Indian National Movement, he perfected it as a technique of love-force, soul-force, non-violent in nature, aiming constantly at the search and pursuit of truthful ends. To him, Satyagraha was the vindication of truth, not by the infliction of suffering on the opponent but on one's own self. It is eternal insistence on truth. Satyagraha is ingrained in non-violence and as such it does not permit violence in any shape or form. Ahimsa and Satyagraha were synonymous words for Gandhiji, Satyagraha emphasises always the purity of means as well as the purity of the man employing those means. It is a moral weapon in the hands of a morally strong person to fight injustice, tyranny or evil and can be applied in individual and public affairs. To quote Gandhiji, "It is a force that may be used by individuals as well as communities. It may be used as well in political as in domestic affairs. Its universal applicability is a demonstration of its permanence and invincibility." Before practising Satyagraha in public life, a Satyagrahi must practise it in domestic or personal life. Like charity, Satyagraha must begin from home.

A man in search of truth, whether in domestic or public life, has a heavy burden of ethical code over his shoulders. He has to be a man of peace. His aim is self-realisation through social service. Satyagraha is a weapon to counteract the evils and obstacles that come in the way of realisation of truthful and just goals. Satyagraha is a weapon to be used for public good and never for personal advantages. Satyagraha is not to be resorted to defend immoral acts and wrongly earned gains. There is no room for ill-will and hatred in Satyagraha. A Satyagrahi does not think, in relation to his opponent, in terms of victor and vanquished. The metal of Satyagrahi is fully tested in the stress and strain of conflict. If it were a superficial mask, the metal would melt away showing the underlying violent nature of the so-called Satyagrahi.

Satyagraha must not be confused with *passive resistance*. It is true that

both are methods of meeting aggression, settling conflicts and bringing about social and political changes. However, there are fundamental differences between the two. Passive resistance as practised is a political weapon of expediency but Satyagraha is a moral weapon based on the superiority of soul force over physical force. Passive resistance is the weapon of the weak but Satyagraha can be practised only by the bravest who have the courage of dying without killing. The passive resister aims at embarrassing opponent into submission. A Satyagrahi aims at weaning the opponent from error by love and patient suffering. There is hardly any place for love for the opponent in the case of passive resistance. In Satyagraha, there is no room for hatred or ill-will. Mahadeo Desai writes, "Satyagraha is dynamic, passive resistance is static. Passive resistance acts negatively and suffers reluctantly. Satyagrahi acts positively and suffers with cheerfulness because from love he makes the suffering fruitful. Passive resistance is not by its very nature universal in its application. It cannot be directed against one's nearest relations as Satyagraha can be. Passive resistance offered in a spirit of weakness and despair weakens the resister psychologically and morally. Satyagraha emphasises all the time internal strength and actually develops the same. Satyagraha can offer more effective and determined opposition to injustice and tyranny than passive resistance."

Forms of Satyagraha

The techniques of Satyagraha may take the form of non-cooperation civil disobedience, Hijrat, fasting and strike. (1) As regards *non-cooperation*, Gandhiji pointed out that oppression and exploitation were possible only on account of the cooperation of the people. If the people refused to cooperate with the Government, the latter could not function. To quote Gandhiji, "Even the most despotic Government cannot stand except with the consent of the governed, which consent is often forcibly procured by the despot. Immediately the subject ceases to fear the despotic force, his power is gone." Non-cooperation may manifest itself in the form of Hartals, social ostracism or picketing. Hartal involved stopping of work as a measure of protest and its object was to strike the imagination of the people and the Government. Hartals to be effective were to be voluntary and no violence was to be used. Those were not to be frequent as they were likely to lose their effect. The persons who refuse to cooperate with the public in their programme of non-cooperation with the Government, were to be boycotted. In the case of picketing also, no force was to be used. Only the persuasive methods were to be employed. To quote Gandhiji, "Object of peaceful picketing is not to block the path of a person wanting to do a particular thing but to rely on the force of public opprobrium and to warn and even shame the blacklegs. Picketing should avoid coercion, intimidation, discourtesy, burning or burying of effigies and hunger strikes."

(2) Another form of Satyagraha recommended by Gandhi was *civil disobedience*. This was regarded by him as "a complete, effective and bloodless substitute of armed revolt." Statutory enactments were to be challenged and violated. Civil disobedience signified "the resister's outlawry in a civil, i.e., non-violent manner." Gandhiji was so much afraid of the Civil Disobedience movement becoming violent that he put the greatest emphasis on the word 'civil'. To quote him, "Disobedience to be civil, must be sincere,

respectful, restrained, never defiant, must be based upon some well-understood principle, must not be capricious and must have no ill-will or hatred behind it." Again, "Its use must be guarded by all conceivable restrictions. Even possible provision should be made against outbreak of violence or general lawlessness. The area as well as scope should also be limited to the barest necessity of the case." Gandhiji's view was that civil disobedience was to be practised only by a selected few and not by the rank and file of the people. The leaders, and not the Satyagrahis, were to decide which laws were to be violated.

According to Gandhiji, civil disobedience was of two types viz., aggressive or assertive or offensive civil disobedience and defensive civil disobedience. The former implies the disregard of laws relating to revenue or regulation of personal conduct for the convenience of the state although those laws do not inflict any hardship and do not require a change. The latter implies the formation of volunteer corps for peaceful purposes, holding of public meetings and publication of articles. The former is a symbol of revolt against the state. The latter is undertaken to vindicate one's self-respect or human dignity. The former involves wilful disobedience. The latter is involuntary or reluctant.

Gandhi's theory of complete non-violence is "like Euclid's point or straight line". In actual practice, one cannot observe complete non-violence. Gandhiji acknowledged this fact and permitted the use of unavoidable violence as a matter of sheer necessity, as an exception to the general rule of non-violence. He allowed the use of violence if it was employed for the benefit of the person against whom it is used" e.g., a surgeon using his knife to operate on his patient. Gandhiji also allowed the use of violence for the protection of society against violent and harmful acts of lower animals e.g., killing of birds and pesticides who eat up the crops. He also did not object to the use of violence by the Government for the protection of society from anti-social elements and to fight the aggressor. He permitted egg-eating and meat-eating by those who believe in it and states, "I have known many meat-eaters to be far more non-violent than vegetarians".

(3) Another form of Satyagraha recommended by Gandhiji was *hijrat* which implied voluntary exile from the permanent place of residence. This was to be done by those "who feel oppressed, cannot live without loss of self-respect in a particular place and lack the strength that comes from true non-violence or the capacity to defend themselves violently." Hijrat was recommended by Gandhiji to the people of Bardoli in 1928 and to the people of Junagarh, Vithalgad and Limbdi in 1939. The Harijans of Kaitha were advised by Gandhiji in 1935 to migrate as the Hindus "were regularly terrorising them and this had caused extreme despondency among the Harijans."

(4) Another form of Satyagraha recommended by Gandhiji was *fasting*. This was considered by him as a fiery weapon and Gandhiji recommended the greatest caution in resorting to fasting. Fasting was not meant for all occasions but only on rare occasions. It could be undertaken for penance and self-purification or for the purpose of resisting injustice and converting the evil-doer. Fasting was to be undertaken only by those who possessed spiritual fitness. It required purity of mind, discipline,

humility and faith. Gandhiji's view was that fasting stirred the sluggish conscience and fired the loving hearts to action. "Those who bring about radical changes in human conditions and surroundings cannot do it except by raising ferment in society. There are only two methods of doing this—violence and non-violence. Non-violent pressure exerted through self-suffering and by fasting touches and strengthens the moral fibre of those against whom it is directed."

(5) Another method of Satyagraha was in the form of *strike*. However, Gandhiji's view of strike was different from that advocated by the Socialists and Communists. According to him, strike was a voluntary, purificatory suffering undertaken to convert the erring opponent. Gandhiji did not believe in the theory of class-war. He did not subscribe to the proposition that labour and capital must remain in the opposite camps. His view was that industry was a joint enterprise of labour and capital and both of them were trustees. The strikers were required to put forward their demands in very clear terms. Those were not to be unjust. Those must be within the reach of the capitalists to concede. The strikers were required to learn some manual craft so that during the strike period they must not have to depend upon the strike fund.

Gandhiji also recommended the formation of Peace Brigade whose members were to apply the basic principles and techniques of Satyagraha at social level. The Brigade was to act as substitute for the police and military and its members were to immolate themselves at the altar of communal frenzy and mob violence. The members of the Brigade were to be of unimpeachable character and have firm faith in the compassion and majesty of God. They were to have equal regard for all religions of the world. They were to wear a distinctive dress.

(6) Gandhiji recommended Satyagraha even in the case of *foreign invasion*. He explained his technique in these words: "A non-violent man or society does not anticipate or provide for attacks from without. On the contrary, such a person or society firmly believes that nobody is going to disturb them. If the worst happens, there are two ways open to non-violence, to yield possession but non-cooperate with the aggressor. Thus supposing that a modern edition of Nero descended upon India, the representatives of the state will let him in but tell him that he will get no assistance from the people. They will prefer death to submission. The second way will be non-violent resistance by a people who have been trained in the non-violent way. They would offer themselves unarmed as fodder for the aggressor's cannon. The underlying belief in either case is that even Nero is not devoid of a heart. The unexpected spectacle of endless rows upon rows of men and women simply dying rather than surrender to the will of an aggressor, must ultimately melt him and his soldiery." Such an advice was given by Gandhiji to the people of Abyssinia when their country was attacked by Italy under Mussolini. The same advice was given to the people of Czechoslovakia and Poland when those countries were attacked by Hitler. When there was the danger of an attack on England by Germany in 1940, Gandhiji gave similar advice to the people of England. When China was being conquered by Japan during the 1930's, Gandhiji observed, "If the Chinese had non-violence of my conception, there would be no use left for the latest machinery of destruction which Japan possesses. The

Chinese would say to Japan, 'Bring all your machinery. We present half of our population to you, but the remaining two hundred millions won't bend their knees to you'. If the Chinese did that, Japan would become China's slave".

In 1916, Gandhiji laid down certain principles to be observed in the Satyagraha Ashram at Sabarmati. Those principles of behaviour were truth, non-violence, non-stealing, non-possession and celibacy. A true Satyagrahi was required to practise those ideals in his day to day private and public life. In course of time, Gandhiji found a few more virtues and qualities to be borne by a Satyagrahi. Those qualities were soul-force, moral discipline, honesty, 'spiritual kinship with the opponent', implicit faith in human nature and goodness, self-inflicted suffering or Tapasya for truth and a will to crucify the flesh by fasting and humility. A Satyagrahi was not to harbour anger, was to suffer the anger of the opponent, was not to retaliate or insult his opponent. If a Satyagrahi violated the rules prescribed by him, Gandhiji preferred to stop the movement than to see the violation of those values. Purity and non-violence of the persons engaged in a cause was always fundamental to him.

Satyagraha depended upon the stage of moral development of the Satyagrahi. There was no point of perfection. Perfectability was to be the motto of the Satyagrahi. He was to keep in his mind a number of things to be done or to be avoided. He was to "overcome evil by good, anger by love, untruth by truth, Himsa by Ahimsa." He was to treat his opponent as a member of his own family and the family method was to be employed to iron out the differences. Trivialities and trifles were not to be magnified into hardened principles. A satyagrahi was to trust his opponent even when the latter had played him false twenty times. He was to employ the democratic methods of persuasion, negotiation and discussion but when those methods failed, other methods of non-cooperation, civil disobedience, fasting etc. were to be tried. A Satyagrahi was required to have an open mind and whenever he found that his own opinion was wrong, he must confess his mistake and revise his judgement accordingly. To quote Gandhiji, "Confession of error is like a broom that sweeps away dirt and leaves the surface cleaner than before." A Satyagrahi was to meet his adversary not to liquidate him but to come to a compromise with him. A Satyagrahi was to compromise on non-essentials and not on fundamentals or the basic moral issues involved in the conflict.

A Satyagrahi has a two-fold responsibility. He is responsible to himself, i.e., to his own inner conscience and to the public opinion. The view of Gandhiji was that if there was a conflict between the two, a Satyagrahi should submit to the public opinion if the matter does not conflict with his moral code. Very often, he has to rely upon his conscience for guidance. Reason is a poor guide as compared to faith or intuition in such situations. There can be situations for a Satyagrahi when he should not surrender his personal moral intuitive judgement to mass opinion and follow the dictates of his conscience and leave free his followers to pursue their own path.

The philosophy of Satyagraha is related to the concept of love and non-violence. A Satyagrahi must have a sound basis for his love or hatred.

Gandhiji hated the British system in India because of its demerits but he did not hate the British in India. A sense of universal brotherhood prevented him from hating them as human beings. A Satyagrahi is able to make a distinction between the evil and the evil-doer. He wins the heart of the opponent through love, persuasion and self-suffering. He must not be obliged to accept the things as they are. His aim is to secure progress and social justice. The non-violence of a Satyagrahi has a psychological impact. The wrong-doer gets tired of doing wrong in the absence of resistance. "All pressure is lost when the victim betrays no resistance." "I seek entirely to blunt the edge of the tyrant's sword, not by putting up against it a sharper-edged weapon, but by disappointing the expectation that I would be offering physical resistance. The resistance of the soul would at first dazzle him and at last compel recognition from him which recognition would not humiliate but uplift him."

According to Gandhiji, Satyagraha is non-violent coercion or mental coercion. Prof. Arthur Moore identifies the term Satyagraha with mental violence. He suggests: "I have criticized the high spiritual claim made for non-violent non-cooperation, because it draws a spiritual distinction between physical and mental violence. It is a method of fighting which is open to unarmed people and is on par with boycott and strikes which are indeed part of its technique.. It is not a distinctly spiritual weaponry more than is armed rebellion or war."

The question arises whether Gandhiji really identified Satyagraha with non-violent coercion or with mental violence. Gandhiji never equated these terms with Satyagraha. What he meant was that though the pressure must be exercised, it must not be allowed to be injurious. The aim of the Satyagrahi is to move the heart of the opponent only by love and not by giving or causing any injury to him. Satyagraha is a weapon which only well-disciplined soldiers can use. He who leads the life of an honest and truthful man, can use it effectively. The user must be fearless. There are two other things viz., non-stealing and non-possession, which are equally important. By non-stealing Gandhiji meant renouncing possession of the things which one does not need. By non-possession he meant the sacrifice of things which are not required in the immediate present. To quote Gandhiji, "Possession implies provision for the future. A seeker after truth, a follower of the Law of Love cannot hold anything against tomorrow. God never stores for the morrow. He never creates more than what is strictly needed for the moment. If, therefore, we repose faith in His Providence, we should rest assured that He will give us every day our daily bread, meaning everything that we require." Non-stealing and non-possession are abstractions and in their absolute sense, they are not realities. Gandhiji admitted, "Theoretically when there is perfect love, there must be perfect non-possession. The body is our last possession. So a man can only exercise perfect love and be completely dispossessed if he is prepared to embrace death and renounce his body for the sake of human service. But that is true in theory only. In actual life, we can hardly exercise perfect love, for the body as a possession will always remain with us. Man will ever remain imperfect and it will always be his part to try to be perfect."

According to Gandhiji, humility and self-restraint must be practised

by the Satyagrahi because they give him strength. At the time of the 1930 movement, Gandhiji formulated the following rules for the Satyagrahis: "The Satyagrahi must harbour no anger, must suffer the anger of his opponent, putting up with assaults but refusing to retaliate; but he must not submit out of fear of punishment or the like to any order given in anger. He must refrain from insults and swearings; he must protect opponent from insults or attack, even at the risk of his life. He must neither resist his arrest for the attachment of his property, but if he has got any property in his possession as a trustee, he must refuse to surrender it even though in defending it he might lose his life. As a prisoner he must behave in an exemplary manner; as a member of his unit in the struggle, he must obey the orders of his leaders although he may resign in the event of serious disagreement. He may not expect guarantees for maintenance of his dependants."

If Satyagraha is a way of life for an individual, it is also a means of corporate action by which through collective non-violent resistance, conflicts are settled and the cause of truth is vindicated. Gandhiji has suggested various precautions, ethical codes to be followed while undertaking Satyagraha as a corporate action. For instance, it must be non-violent direct action. The opponent should not be embarrassed. His difficulty should not be an opportunity for the Satyagrahi. Effort must be to reform and convert the opponent and not to humiliate or destroy him. However, the desire not to embarrass the opponent should not degenerate into cowardice. When moral principles are jeopardized, when insult and humiliation is imposed on the Satyagrahi by opponent, non-violent resistance becomes his sacred duty irrespective of the fact whether the opponent is in difficulty or not. Mass Satyagraha has to be undertaken only for the purpose of social good and not for personal, selfish purposes. The touchstone is social good or a major cause of the community. The cause should be concrete, precise and understandable by the members of the community. Minimum, clear-cut and precise demands have to be formulated to be placed before the opponent. The issue should not be confused or mixed with other issues or movements. Gandhiji laid emphasis on "open-dealing" in Satyagraha. Everything, discussions or settlement of the dispute, should be done openly and above board. The reason is that truth and secrecy do not go together.

Satyagraha is a struggle for righteousness. It is a vindication of the right of opposition to coercive authority by an individual. No force in the world is so direct and so swift in working as Satyagraha is. It is progressive in character. Gandhiji's advocacy of the right of Satyagraha is a great contribution to political thought and world civilization. As a moral technique for waging the battle of national freedom, Satyagraha attained dramatic and historic character. According to Stanley Jones, Satyagraha is the greatest contribution of Gandhiji to the world. D. E. Smith describes Gandhiji as a revolutionary leader on account of his developing a technique for precipitating conflict and then resolving it non-violently.

The question arises whether the ideas of Gandhiji are relevant for us today when we find ourselves surrounded in our day to day life by so-called Satyagrahas, Dharnas, fasts unto death, Gheraoes. Gandhiji put emphasis on means and on the quality of the man undertaking the action.

What is happening today falls short of the Gandhian standard of values and methods. We find around ourselves strikes, fasts, dharnas, satyagrahas, picketings, gheraoes and many more things of the same kind all undertaken to back some demands whether they relate to the formation of a state, changes in the boundaries of a state, removal of a particular person from office, or establishment of an industrial plant, or for getting jobs for the unemployed etc. What has happened is that the techniques of Gandhiji have been accepted without the spirit behind them. Ends are more important to them than the ethos and spirit of the techniques. The emphasis today is not on the right man behind the action or movement. It is suggested that if the Gandhian spirit is imbibed by the new generation, many of the problems can be solved without recourse to violence or offence to individual dignity. Gandhiji's technique can be employed successfully to fight the evils of corruption, defection, black-marketing or injustices in economic, industrial or social life. Without bloodshed, violence or affront to human dignity, social changes can be brought about.

Gandhian Concept of Trusteeship

The theory of trusteeship constitutes one of the cornerstones of Gandhian concept of socialism. Gandhiji subscribed to the view that if the wealthy and the possessing class hold their surplus wealth on behalf of society as trustee and use their talent and creativity for earning wealth for the society, an egalitarian society shall be ushered in without violence, bloodshed, dispossession of the propertied class and all the vices associated with them. Gandhiji had so much of confidence in the potency of this technique of social change that he is said to have observed, "I am confident that it will survive all other theories."

According to Gandhiji, the wealthier sections of the community, instead of utilising all the resources at their disposal for accumulating their wealth and personal belongings, at the expense of the poor workers and peasants, should work as trustees of their superfluous wealth on behalf of the society and spend the same not for their own comfort but for the good of the community at large. If the wealthy and the possessing classes act in a spirit of service and with the mental make-up of trustees, the rigour of the capitalist system, i.e., profiteering, exploitation, inequality and poverty for millions, would vanish and the road to socialism would be duly paved. To quote Gandhiji, "Indeed at the root of this doctrine of equal distribution must lie that of the trusteeship of the wealthy for the superfluous wealth possessed by them."

Gandhiji did not completely rule out the continuance of the rulers of the Princely states and Zamindars in free India provided they changed their socio-economic outlook and behaved as trustees holding their position and power, wealth and property, on behalf of the people and serving their interests. Gandhiji said on 8 August 1942 that the princes should renounce their ownership over their properties and become their trustees in the true sense of the term. He called upon the princes to become servants of the people and render to them an account of their services. The opinion of Gandhiji was that the princes, as servants and trustees of their people, were worthy of their hire.

Many writers have attributed motives to Gandhiji for his theory of trusteeship. Dr. B. R. Ambedkar wrote thus: "Mr. Gandhi does not wish to hurt the propertied class. He is even opposed to a campaign agaist them. He has no passion for economic equality". The view of E.M.S. Namboodiripad is that Gandhiji's "theory of trusteeship, his insistence on certain moral values as the guiding lines for any political activity..proved in actual practice, to be of enormous help to the bourgeoisie". Prof. Hiren Mukherjee writes about Gandhiji, "He was ready to be gentle even with flagrantly self-seeking and fundamentally anti-social vested interests, and in his pre-occupation with the right kind of means for social change, he would make compromises and concessions to the status quo which were often inexplicable and in their implications as in the idea of the rich being trustees of the poor, positively pernicious." Hence Kishorelal Mashruwala observed, "Progressive politicians suspected that Gandhiji had obliged the princes, the Zamindars, the capitalists and holders of power by subtly furnishing them with one more weapon to cling to their respective positions of advantage."

It is true that the industrialists and businessmen made liberal donations for the running of the Ashramas of Gandhiji and for implementing his constructive programmes, but it is not correct to say that his theory of trusteeship was a concession to moneyed classes for their liberal donations. The fact is that Gandhiji subscribed to the idea of trusteeship much earlier than his association with the Birlas or other millionaires. Gandhiji's concept of trusteeship was not intended to be used as an instrument to safeguard the vested interests. It is not a Gandhian apparatus to "patch up the conflict between landlords and tenants or between labour and capital" so that the sympathies of the capitalists and landlords were not alienated and a united and solid front of nationalists was forged against the British Government at the time of the liberation struggle. To quote Gandhiji, "My theory of trusteeship is no make-shift, certainly no camouflage."

Basis of Trusteeship System

The theory of trusteeship of Gandhiji derived its inspiration from the Bhagavad Gita, the Upanishads, Indian cultural heritage, Snell's Equity and the life and messages of Tolstoy and Ruskin. It stood on 5 pillars provided by his concept of Sarvodaya and particularly the moral uplift of all, his theory of bread-labour, his doctrine of non-violent socialism, his faith in the goodness of all individuals and their reformability and the pragmatic consideration that trusteeship was more conducive to real socialist objective than any other method.

(1) Gandhiji's concept of Sarvodaya implied the welfare of all and all-round and balanced development of each individual. Gandhiji was convinced that accumulation of wealth by any individual was inconceivable without exploitation and violence. Hence the accumulation of wealth was considered by Gandhiji as unethical, immoral and a sin from which individuals must be liberated. The bounties of nature were meant for the benefit of the entire world. Each individual was entitled to acquire only that much of wealth or property which was essential for his immediate need or existence. He had no right to acquire more than what was needed to satisfy his absolute and immediate needs, particularly when millions

were unable to satisfy their most basic requirements. Having in view the interests of millions of those who were living a sub-human existence, Gandhiji said, "You and I have no right to anything that we really have until these millions are clothed and fed better." To acquire and accumulate more than what was needed to satisfy one's immediate need was treated by Gandhiji as a theft. According to Gandhiji, no individual had a right to acquire more than his "legitimate need" or "honourable livelihood." Gandhiji advocated the cultivation of a concept of detachment from wealth and utilisation for oneself only a portion of it that was needed for meeting one's "legitimate need" and "honourable livelihood". To quote Gandhiji, "Supposing I have come by a fair amount of wealth by way of legacy or by means of trade and industry. I must know that all that wealth does not belong to me; what belongs to me is the right to an honourable livelihood no better than that enjoyed by millions of others." Gandhiji considered renunciation of one's possession or non-possession of one's wealth as an admirable ideal to be aimed at. As a practical idealist, he realised that it was highly painful to renounce one's wealth and strip oneself of all the possessions except one's absolute minimum. Possession itself gave a sense of satisfaction and security and people were normally hesitant to part with it. The solution suggested by Gandhiji was the shedding of possessiveness, if not possession, and greed for wealth if not wealth itself. The owners of wealth may still hold their wealth but they should consider their superfluous wealth as the property of the community and themselves as trustees of that wealth to be utilised for the benefit of the community. Gandhiji realised that mankind was not going to give up possession of their wealth in the near future and wrote, "I accept the proposition that it is better not to desire wealth than to acquire it and become its trustee. But what am I to advise those who are already wealthy or who would not shed their desire for wealth? I can only say to them that they should use their wealth for service".

Gandhiji considered his concept of trusteeship as a practical proposition which could liberate the wealthy and the possessing class of their sins of acquisitiveness and greed and effect a change-over in favour of an egalitarian society. To quote Gandhiji, "Earn your crores by all means. But understand that your wealth is not yours, it belongs to the people. Take what you require for your legitimate need and use the remainder for society".

Gandhiij's concept of Sarvodaya led him step by step to adopt the technique of trusteeship. To quote Gandhiji, "Man's ultimate aim is the realisation of God and all his activities, social, political, religious, have to be guided by the ultimate vision of God. The immediate service of all human beings becomes a necessary part of the endeavour, simply because the only way to find God is to see Him in His creation and be one with it. This can only be done by service of all." Again, "Man becomes great exactly in the degree in which he works for the welfare of his fellow men." Gandhiji believed that a full life was possible not through acquisition of wealth and amassing of fortunes but through "realisation of God" which could be attained by "service of all human beings" and "performance of works for the welfare of fellowmen."

(2) Gandhiji's concept of bread-labour also contributed to his theory

of trusteeship. According to Gandhiji, each individual must perform sufficient labour in order to entitle himself to lay his claim on his bread. Labour was the only passport to one's living and those who did not perform any labour were not entitled to their bread. All those who performed labour got the right to their bread but not more. Gandhiji felt that if all laboured adequately to earn their bread and got in return only enough to meet their absolute and immediate needs, much of the problems of the present society would be automatically solved.

Gandhiji's concept of bread-labour did not imply that men of greater ability and vigour shall not work more than what was necessary to earn their absolute minimum. He also did not propagate the view that men of more than average strength and vigour, resourcefulness and enterprise, intellectual ability and excellence, were to allow their additional ability and energy to be frittered away or wasted. He did not fix a premium on idleness, inactivity, inefficiency, mental incapacity and intellectual deficiencies. Gandhiji realised that society will be poorer unless men of ability kept themselves active throughout. What Gandhiji wanted was that individuals with more than average or unusual ability shall work according to their capacity but shall get in return for themselves only what was required for fulfilling their legitimate needs. While working with full vigour, they were to keep a fraction for themselves and give the rest to the community. Gandhiji's concept of bread-labour made the more capable persons trustees of their additional ability, beyond and above what was needed to earn their livelihood, on behalf of society utilising them for the benefit of society. To quote Gandhiji, "If all work for their bread, distinctions of rank would be obliterated; the rich would still be there, but they would deem themselves only trustees of their property and use it mainly in the public interest."

(3) Another basis of his concept of trusteeship was his faith in man. He did not agree with Marx that the bourgeoisie as a class is highly selfish, self-seeking and egoistic and is primarily concerned with its own interest. He also did not agree with the view that the artisans, prosperous peasants and intellectual aristocracy were too much steeped in their self-interest to think of anything other than own welfare and to speak of their compassion for society was a mere self-deception. He also did not agree with the view that the privileged classes could not be expected to change their nature under any circumstances and were beyond reform and beyond redemption. He also did not subscribe to the view that the only way to improve the present situation was to eliminate and liquidate all the privileged classes by violence.

Gandhiji had profound faith in the basic goodness of human beings. Individuals were sparks of the Divine. If some individuals were depraved or deficient, that was due to their defiled environment. Left to himself, each individual shall exhibit the Divinity in his character. To quote Gandhiji, "I refuse to suspect human nature".

Gandhiji's faith in human nature led him to love the British people although he hated British imperialism and exploitation. To quote Gandhiji, "Non-cooperators never told the people that the British or General Dyer were bad, but they were victims of a system. So that the system must be destroyed and not the individual." Again, "I have discovered that man is

superior to system he propounded and so I feel that Englishmen as individuals are infinitely better than the system they have evolved as a corporation." Gandhiji was asked whether Englishmen would leave India as a result of non-violent agitation, non-cooperation and Satyagraha and his reply was in the affirmative. In his reply to the critics who doubted British withdrawal from India voluntarily, Gandhiji said, "Your difficulty arises from your disinclination to believe that Britain can ever do justice voluntarily. My belief in the capacity of non-violence rejects the theory of permanent inelasticity of human nature." Gandhiji believed that even the Indian princes shall voluntarily surrender their power and pivileges.

Gandhiji also had ample faith in the selfless and self-sacrificing nature of the capitalists, the bourgeoisie and the privileged classes. According to him, the privileged people or the capitalists were exploiting the toiling millions not because they were fundamentally bad but bcause they had become victims of the evil system called capitalism. According to Gandhiji, there is a finer, subtler and a more vital chord in every human heart that is noble, self-sacrificing and full of compassion for others. Sometimes the lust of greed, selfishness and egoism may accumulate on this chord, but properly handled the subtle chord in human heart could transmit the melodious music of sacrifice, self-suffering and renunciation for the benefit of others. Gandhiji did not advocate the elimination or liquidation of the capitalists but of the capitalist system of exploitation. He was an enemy of capitalism and not of capitalists. To quote him, "I do not fight shy of capital, I fight capitalism."

Gandhiji did not find any antagonism between capital and labour and he wanted to establish just relations between the two. Gandhiji believed that the rich, inspired by a sense of compassion for their fellow-beings, could act trustees of their superfluous wealth on behalf of the community. To quote him, "I have always said that my ideal is that capital and labour should supplement and help each other. They should be a great family living in unity, and harmony, capital not only looking to the material welfare of the labourers, but their moral welfare also—capitalists being trustees for the welfare of the labouring classes under them."

Gandhiji believed that every human being could be reformed, however depraved and degraded he may be. As all individuals were basically good and only adverse circumstances and evil system tainted their conduct and character, those stains in human nature were superficial and transitory and those could be removed with conscious human effort. Gandhiji's faith in man and the possibility of his reform if he was bad, led him to accept the position that the capitalists and the privileged people could be made to serve the interests of society by giving up their possessions and privileges and acting as trustees.

(4) Gandhiji's concept of trusteeship was also due to his doctrine of non-violent socialism or socialism through the application of non-violent methods. As an apostle of non-violence, Gandhiji wanted to establish an egalitarian society where there was no exploitation or violence. His reliance on non-violence made Gandhiji an advocate of trusteeship.

According to Gandhiji, non-possession or renunciation of possession and practice of charity were the real norms to measure the extent of love

or non-violence one practises in his social conduct. To the extent one renounces his possession or property and practises charity for the sake of community, he rises in the scale of non-violence or love. The true believers in non-violence renounce their possessions for the sake of their fellow beings.

Gandhiji was an idealist but a practical idealist. He never failed to realise the fact that it is difficult, almost impossible, for many to completely identify their interests with those of the society and make complete renunciation of their possessions. According to Gandhiji, even if complete renunciation was not a practical proposition for many members of the possessing class, those who were inspired by the philosophy of non-violence and love, must ceaselessly strive to attain that ideal.

A believer in positive non-violence should renounce all personal enjoyment and indulgence. He should reduce his wants to the minimum and utilise his surplus wealth for the good of the community. The view of Gandhiji was that those of the possessing class who shall be inspired by the spirit of non-violence and positive love, shall practise the principle of trusteeship in their life. To quote Gandhiji, "The rich man will be left in possession of his wealth of which he will use what he reasonably requires for his personal needs and will act as a trustee for the remainder to be used for society."

Gandhiji justified his system of trusteeship on the ground of non-violence. According to him, the state was the very personification of violence and that violence may be accentuated and magnified if economic powers were also given to the state, hence, Gandhiji thought of the system of trusteeship as an alternative device to avoid violence. To quote Gandhiji, "The state represents violence in a concentrated and organised form. The individual has a soul, but as the state is a soulless machine, it can never be weaned from violence to which it owes its very existence. Hence I prefer the doctrine of trusteeship." Former Chief Justice P. B. Gajendragadkar wrote, "The great exponent of Ahimsa that he was, he did not tolerate the idea of the inevitability of class conflict and the indispensability of strikes and lockouts. He thought that if the employers and industrialists treated themselves as trustees, the problem of evolving industrial harmony and making economic justice a reality could be solved non-violently on the strength of the doctrine of love."

(5) Gandhiji also justified the trusteeship of the rich on account of pragmatic considerations. As a practical idealist, Gandhiji realised that the economy of India would not be able to usher in an egalitarian society of affluence if the entire economy was taken over by the state. Gandhiji wanted not only equality and social justice but also wanted that there should be nutritious food, a decent house, medical care, enough clothing and adequate resources for the education of the children. His view was that the mere transfer of economy from the private hands to the state would not be able to guarantee that minimum for all. He was convinced that the mere transfer of ownership from the private entrepreneurs, agriculturists and industrialists to the state was not enough to ensure maximum production, higher level of consumption and enough prosperity to the nation. Economic prosperity demanded the handling of economic enterprises by men of experience and business and industrial acumen who had the ex-

perience of floating, managing and running industrial and commercial enterprises. Capital as a factor of production was essential and accumulation of capital was an art that could not be mastered by anybody and everybody. If the wealthy were allowed to manage such enterprises and earn reasonable profits by just and legitimate means and use the surplus wealth so produced for the good of society, acting as trustees, the society would be richer. To quote Gandhiji, "We must not under-rate the business talent and know-how, which the owning class have acquired, through generations of experience and specialization." Gandhiji wanted to take full advantage of the ability of the wealthy and the possessing classes or the capitalists. He wanted the capitalists to give up their greed, egoism and acquisitiveness and work for the good of society.

Under the trusteeship system, the rich and the wealthy were given a dignified and legitimate place. They were to renounce their possessiveness and make themselves the vehicles of social change. Trusteeship provided a means for transforming the capitalist order of society into an egalitarian one.

It is worthy of notice that even the admirers of Gandhiji were doubtful about the practicability of Gandhiji's concept of trusteeship. To quote Jawaharlal Nehru, "Is it reasonable to believe in the theory of trusteeship to give unchecked power and wealth to an individual and to expect him to use it entirely for the public good? Are the best of us so perfect as to be trusted in this way? Even Plato's philosopher-kings could hardly have borne this burden worthily. And is it good for the others to have even these benevolent supermen over them?" G. D. Birla also felt that the theory of Gandhiji could not be put into practice because everybody wanted to evade payment if the same was at all possible. Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao writes, "The vast majority of us are earth-bound and selfish and tend to treat both ability and property as instruments of personal aggrandisement. Under the circumstances any attempt to usher in a socialist society through the mechanism of the principle of trusteeship is not likely to succeed unless it is made a compulsory way of life and such compulsion cannot but rests on force and the formidable apparatus of state machinery which rests ultimately on the sanction of force." It is true that Gandhiji was fully conscious of the imperfections, selfishness and egoism of human beings. but he had profound faith in man and that is why he propagated the idea of trusteeship as a practical proposition and not as an unrealistic dream of a visionary. To quote Gandhiji, "Those who own money now are asked to behave like trustees, holding their riches on behalf of the poor. You may say that trusteeship is a legal fiction. But if people meditate over it constantly and try to act up to it, then life on earth would be governed far more by love than it is at present."

Gandhiji was aware of the fact that all the wealthy people may not be able to grasp the philosophy of trusteeship and practise it in their lives. Even those who grasped the philosophy of trusteeship may not be able to live as real trustees. Even then the idea of trusteeship was a lofty ideal worth striving for. Even if perfect trusteeship was not attainable and very few people were worthy of practising it in actual life, much of the exploitation and social inequality would be removed and the world would be a better place to live in. Whatever was attainable by limited application

of the principle of trusteeship, would far exceed the attainment through any other method.

The view of Gandhiji was that although all moneyed persons may not behave as trustees, there was no dearth of persons who were ready to experiment the theory of trusteeship in their personal lives. In that connection, Gandhiji referred to the life of Jamnalal Bajaj who gave all his wealth for the welfare of his fellowmen. Another example of such a trustee was Ghanshyam Das Birla. He also spent his wealth for the good of the people. Gandhiji was convinced that many rich and wealthy persons were capable of leading a life of trustees for the society. Gandhiji did not consider the concept of trusteeship of the rich as a wishful thinking and mere romanticism of some inspired and impractical idealist, unrealizable in real life. Trusteeship was not only attainable in real life, but if honestly pursued, it could solve the problems of society which had too much of inequality. It was immaterial for Gandhiji as to how many people were living the life of trustees or how many were capable of leading such a life in the day to day world. To quote him, "The question how many can be real trustees is beside the point. If the theory is true, it is immaterial whether many live upto it or only one man lives upto it. The question is of conviction."

Methods to Establish Trusteeship

(1) Gandhiji suggested means for the achievement of his ideals of trusteeship by the rich. If the rich did not act as trustees of their wealth voluntarily, Gandhiji will not mind giving them a warning that if they did not become trustees voluntarily, the consequences would be disastrous for them. The non-violence of Gandhiji was not that of the weak and the spineless, but of the strong and the chivalrous who were capable of committing violence but desisted from it on moral, spiritual and ethical grounds. When Gandhiji found that many propertied people were not voluntarily converting themselves into trustees, he did not desist from administering a dose of warning to the possessing classes. While advising the Zamindars and Talukdars to cultivate the spirit of the Japanese nobles, read the sign of the time, revise their motives and hold their wealth as trustees for the good of the people and the Ryots, he warned them in these words: "There is no other choice than between voluntary surrender on the part of the capitalist of the superfluities and consequent acquisition of the real happiness of all on the one hand, and on the other the impending chaos into which, if the capitalist does not wake up betimes, awakened but ignorant, famishing millions will plunge the country which, not even the armed force that a powerful Government can bring into play, can avert." Again, "A violent and bloody revolution is a certainty one day unless there is a voluntary abdication of riches and the power that riches give and sharing them for the common good." Gandhiji asked the propertied class to ponder over the legality and morality of their possession and their duty towards society. He told them that their wealth was the cause of their worries, anxiety, unhappiness and insecurity. To quote him, "If the moneyed classes do not even act on it in these times of stress, they will remain the slaves of their riches and passions and consequently of those who overpower them. I see coming the day of the rule of the poor, whether that rule be through force of arms

or of non-violence." Again, "As for the present owners of wealth, they would have to make their choice between class-war and voluntarily converting themselves into trustees of their wealth."

(2) The view of Gandhiji was that if in spite of all manner of persuasion and moral pressure, the privileged sections of society failed to live up to the ideal of trusteeship, the *technique of social compulsion* short of violence or coercion could be used against them. Gandhiji recommended the technique of non-violent struggle against the propertied classes so that they could be compelled to convert themselves into trustees. Gandhiji believed that production under any system was possible because of labour or the cooperation of labour with the existing system and method of production. To quote Gandhiij, "The rich cannot accumulate wealth without the cooperation of the poor in society." Again, "All exploitation is based on cooperation, willing or forced of the exploited." If the labourers and peasants resorted to non-cooperation, production would evaporate and the accumulation of wealth will stop with no scope for the welfare of the people. To quote Gandhiij, "If however, in spite of the utmost effort, the rich do not become guardians of the poor in the true sense and the latter are more and more crushed and die of hunger, what is to be done? In trying to find the solution to this riddle, I have lighted on non-violent non-cooperation and civil disobedience as the right and infallible means." Gandhiji advocated the adoption of non-violent non-cooperation in order to convert the rebellious landlords into trustees. To quote him, "The moment the cultivators of the soil realise their power, the Zamindari evil will be sterilised. What can the poor Zamindar do when they say that they will simply not work the land, unless they are paid enough to feed and clothe and educate themselves and their children in a decent manner? In reality the tiller is the owner of what he produces. If the tillers intelligently combine, they will become an irresistible power."

Although Gandhiji denounced violence as a technique of social revolution, he recommended the use of non-violent non-cooperation against the propertied class so that its members may be compelled to convert themselves into trustees. The labour or the working class must become conscious of its strength. If all the labourers without exception lower down their tools, the entire economy may be paralysed and the rich made to realise the real strength of labour. Although pressure exercised by the labourers can compel the wealthy sections to yield and act as trustees, but because they are divided, trusteeship does not become a practical proposition.

Statutory Trusteeship

Gandhiji advocated the *adoption of statutory measures or legislation* to give effect to his idea of trusteeship. He did not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and use of wealth.

Although Gandhiji realised the necessity of providing a statutory basis or a legal sanction to the idea of trusteeship, the statute which Gandhiji had in mind was not to be imposed from above by the state, the same was to emanate from Gram Panchayats after a free and full discussion and proper appreciation of the principles by the people in general. To quote Gandhiji, "Such a statute will not be imposed from above. It will have to come from below. When the people understand the implication of

trusteeship and the atmosphere is ripe for it, the people themeselves beginning with Gram Panchayats will begin to introduce such statutes. Such a thing coming from below is easy to swallow. Coming from above, it is liable to prove a dead weight." The basis of the trusteeship statute was not force or violence, power and authority but the consent of the people in general. There will be an element of compulsion in the statute but that compulsion took into account the considered opinion of all members of the society and was based on the common consent of the people. A democratically constituted society could coerce and compel the unenlightened souls to be free, to see reason and liberate their souls from greed and acquisitiveness. Gandhiji did not overlook the potency of the technique of persuasion and conversion to aid and effectualise the statutory enactments. Persuasion and conversion were to precede statutory enactments so that the propertied people were mentally prepared to accept the statutory enactments. The conversion was to come under the pressure of public opinion.

Gandhiji also felt that the state may be depended upon for the introduction of trusteeship. Educating the public is a time-consuming process and for the sake of the long-term interest of the nation, Gandhiji was prepared to allow state-intervention to force trusteeship upon the rich and privileged classes. To quote Gandhiji, "I would be very happy indeed if the people concerned behaved as trustees, but if they fail, I believe we shall have to deprive them of their possessions through the state." Gandhiji was afraid of the employment of too much of violence by the state and hence he recommended that the state should exercise minimum violence against the propertied class.

Commission of the Trustees

The trustees were expected to fall in line and have satisfaction of their basic needs. However, Gandhiji was not prepared to give too much of money to the trustees. The trustees were to be given commissions on their accumulated wealth. That commission had to be directly related to the level of income and the standard of living prevailing in the country. The trustees could spend out of their wealth a requisite amount necessary for the fulfilment of their basic needs. Although they were to possess their entire wealth, they could not spend legitimately anything more than their neighbours. The commission of a trustee was to depend upon what was considered adequate to meet his essential needs and not a coin more than one's neighbours. "The state would regulate the rate of commission which they would get commensurate with the service rendered and its value to the society." The emphasis was on the service rendered to the society. According to Gandhiji, the more efficient trustees, holding considerably vast wealth, were to be paid higher rates of commission than the less enterprising trustees who did not have much. The amount of commission was to be proportionate and directly related to the services and sacrifices rendered by the trustees to the society. Different amounts of commission were to be paid to different trustees but that should not be less than what was necessary to fulfil their basic needs. The difference between minimum and maximum income should be reasonable and equitable and variable from time to time so that the same can be removed

in the long run. At one time, Gandhiji was prepared to concede a maximum of 25% of the entire wealth held in trust as commission but nothing more. Later on, he was prepared to give even 75% as commission. Gandhiji did not overlook the fact that such a high rate of commission to the trustees will be a very big concession but he defended it on the ground that it will create an atmosphere of peace and goodwill and hence worthwhile. Moreover, that high rate of commission could be eliminated in the long run. Gandhiji was prepared to concede to the trustees 50% of their wealth in the form of commission but his plan was one of progressive reduction of the percentage of commission. Commission could not be a fixed figure because that would result in grave injustice.

Successors of Trustees

Gandhiji was prepared to give to the trustees the right to nominate their successors but their choice was to be ratified by the Gram Panchayats of the state.

In order to be successor of a trustee, one must have the requisite spirit of a trustee. The children of a trustee need not be his successors as trustees. They may not be so enlightened as to give up their greed and possessiveness and live a life socially dedicated and ethically oriented to hold the interest of the community superior to self-interest.

A trustee performs a social responsibility and if he has no legatee or beneficiary, it is the society which can rightly claim to inherit the property. To quote Gandhiji, "A trustee has no heir, but the public". A true heir and successor of a trustee must hold in the highest esteem the interests of the society and must earn his right to trusteeship by dint of his conduct and character, by shedding his acquisitiveness and possessiveness.

Estimate of Trusteeship

It has rightly been said that the Gandhian concept of trusteeship is one of the most important and original contributions to the realm of socialist thought. It is strictly in consonance with the Gandhian emphasis on non-violence. It shows that Gandhiji was not a mere dreamer or an impractical idealist but a socialist strategist far better than many of his predecessors in that field. The trusteeship approach is primarily voluntary and not compulsive. It relies too much on the purity of personal conduct of the possessing class, their renunciation of greed, acquisitiveness and love of possession and sublimation of their self for the sake of social good. It was based on the conviction that human nature was essentially good and could be actually reformed for the good of society. The Gandhian concept of trusteeship is an innovation that aims at securing an egalitarian society. To quote C. Rajagopalachari, "The doctrine of trusteeship adumbrated by Gandhiji, namely that the rich people should hold their superfluous wealth as trustees for the poor and that this way of life should be inculcated by example as well as precept without compulsion or cruelty, is the only true alternative to Marxism." Dr. V. K. R. V. Rao writes, "Trusteeship by individual rather than ownership by the

state makes for a greater measure of personal freedom and individual individual initiative than is associated with a socialist state of the Marxist or statist variety with its bureaucratic proliferation and curbs on individual initiative."

Kamladevi Chttopadhyaya writes, "Gandhiji's concept of trusteeship and change of hreart are inextricably interlinked together. In fact, his entire philosophy is based on the belief in the essential goodness of man. What Gandhi wanted to be done in the end was to break the concentration of power by entrusting it to a society as a whole. What he pleaded was that the weapons used in all the struggles should be love and non-violence, not of fear and hate." Such a theory of trusteeship preaches a sort of self-denial in a world which overwhelmingly stands for ostentatious life. Kamladevi concludes, "Such a life of self-denial could only be possible in a monastery".

Gandhiji's concept of trusteeship is unrealistic and cannot be realised. It smacks of idealism, difficult of attainment. The bourgeoisie cannot behave as a trustee. There is a Russian proverb : "Men meet, mountains never greet". It may be necessary for a society to wait till ternity for a peaceful transformation of human mind to make the ideal of trusteeship a reality. The concept of trusteeship gives the feeling of being more of an illusion than a practical solution. Gandhiji agreed that history does not provide the evidence of such a change in human nature but he maintained that such changes had taken place in individuals. The fact that the possessors of wealth had not acted up to the theory did not prove the falsity of the theory.

It is a mistake to condemn outright the Gandhian concept of trusteeship. The concept may not be practical but it is not entirely baseless. The conflict in modern times between the ideologies of capitalism and communism brings out the relevance of trusteeship. It provides a salvation and a way to eradicate economic disparities, maladjustments between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat and the elimination of unjust distribution of wealth in a non-violent manner. The concept can be better understood as a solution for class conflicts if one sees the inevitable link between trusteeship and Satyagraha. Voluntary acceptance of trusteeship was only a temporary expedient in Gandhian scheme. It was Satyagraha which was permanent and effective remedy for all kinds of injustice in society. The Bhoodan or Gramdan of Vinoba Bhave are aspects of the application of the Gandhian theory of trusteeship.

Criticism of Urban Civilisation

Gandhiji criticised very severely modern urban civilisation. He pointed out contradictions between urban civilisation and rural civilisation. His view was that urban civilisation was undermining the authority of the law of non-violence and turning it into a menace to mankind. The modern state and the existing social and economic systems were the products of urban civilisation. They were a reflection of its sterile and uncreative character. According to Gandhiji, the real problem before humanity was to deal with the edifice of modern urban civilisation and to replace it by a simpler rural type of civilisation. The curse of urban civilisation is that it "takes note neither of morality nor of religion. Its votaries calmly state that their business is not to teach religion. Some even consider it

superstitious growth. Others put on the cloak of religion and prate about morality. Immorality is often taught in the name of morality. Civilisation seeks to increase bodily comforts and it fails miserably even in doing so".

According to Gandhiji, urban civilisation is Godless and immoral and hence incapable of elevating human nature. The social and political institutions created by urban civilisation cramp the spirit of man. There is no qualitative difference between democratic and totalitarian Governments as both represent concentrated and organised violence characteristic of urban civilisation. The state is an instrument of exploitation and destroyer of individuality. The party system and its discipline, and the hypocrisy and selfishness of the members have made them "talking shops" or "costly toys of the nations".

The view of Gandhiji was that machinery and industrialism represent sin and are a curse for mankind. They enslave the workers, render the land unhappy, sap the moral being and cause unemployment in society. They result in large cities, tramcars, railways and promote the exploitation of the weaker nations by the strong. The craze for machinery has ruined the entire economic set-up. To quote Gandhiji, "The scientific truths and discoveries should first of all cease to be mere instruments of greed. Then labourers will not be over-worked and machinery instead of becoming a hindrance, will be a help. I am aiming not at eradication of all machinery, but limitation."

Gandhiji criticised the role of railways in the urban civilisation. They spread and carry plague germs. They increase the frequency and pressure of famines. They accentuate the evil nature of man. They have made the holy places of India unholy.

The educational system in urban civilisation enslaves the people. It increases hypocrisy and deceit. It encourages the small educated class to cheat and strike terror into the hearts of the other people.

Lawyers and doctors enslave the people instead of serving them. They violate the religious instincts. They accentuate communal dissensions. They extend the authority of urban civilisation. Hospitals propagate sin. Men take less care of their bodies and become slaves to drugs.

Gandhiji wrote, "Little do town-dwellers know how the semi-starved masses of India are slowly sinking to lifelessness. Little do they know that their miserable comfort represents the brokerage they get for the work they do for the foreign exploiter, that the profits and brokerage are sucked from the masses. Little do they realize that Government established by law in British India is carried on for this exploitation of the masses. No sophistry, no jugglery in figures can explain away the evidence that the skeletons in many villages present to the naked eye. I have no doubt whatsoever that both England and the town-dwellers of India will have to answer, if there is a God above, for this crime against humanity which is perhaps unequalled in history."

Ideal Society

While Gandhiji criticised urban civilisation, he gave his own view of what he called ideal society. In an ideal society, indepedence was to be

political, economic and moral. His ideal society was to be completely non-violent in which "there will be neither paupers nor beggars, high or low, neither millionaires nor half-starved employees, nor intoxicating drinks nor drugs." In his ideal society, there was to be no place for "drones, idlers or loafers and no labours would be considered too high or too low." In his ideal society, Gandhiji ruled out the use of any machinery. However, he agreed that machines will remain as they were inevitable. Machine should be used to the extent that they subserve the growth of the soul. An example of his ideal society was to be traced to the autonomous village communities in India. Villages should form a federation based on voluntary cooperation and mutual help. Morality and not coercion is the binding force. There was to be no police or law courts in the ideal society.

Gandhiji's view of ideal society was not achieveable due to human imperfections. Gandhiji admitted that the ideal society without the police and law courts was utopian. The first characteristic of such an ideal society is statelessnes. For Gandhiji, the individual was of highest consideration and what tended to suppress it, must go. In his ideal society. the individual acquired complete inner democracy and consequently needed no external authority in the form of a state to regulate his social behaviour. Another reason for shunning the state was that the external authority of the state is always rooted in violence and can never be weaned from it.

The ideal society of Gandhiji was like a nest which protects and fosters and not like a cage which imprisons.

His repudiation of the state does not make him a political anarchist. He accepted the state though only as a necessary evil and an instrument of good. He tried to strike a balance between individual freedom and social restraint. He did not want the individual to be reduced to a mere cog in the wheels of state machinery. He justified the state only to the extent to which it helps in the realisation of the welfare of the individuals. The statelessness of Gandhiji was different from Marxian statelessness. Marxian statelessness is based on purely economic grounds but that of Gandhiji is based on moral and ethical grounds. Gandhiji differs from T. H. Green whose argument is that freedom postulates rights and rights demand the state. Gandhiji found the essence of freedom in self-discipline and self-mastery which do not need the state. Gandhiji's stress on will and not on coercion, brings him nearer to Green. There is also a similarity between the two when they detail the functions of the state, mostly based on "hinder hindrances" to liberty.

Gandhiji's concept of the ideal state followed his condemnation of parliamentary democracy of the British type. He described parlimentary Government in England as a "sterile woman" and "prostitute.". His view was that "Western democracy as it functions today is diluted Nazism or Fascism". A few persons capture power in the name of the people and abuse it.

Gandhiji entrusted political authority with the role and functions both of a policeman and a reformer. He realised that the authority of the state was necessary to protect the people against foreign powers, against

wrong-doers, against natural calamities, corruption, starvation and illiteracy. He wanted the state to stop untouchability, drinking, gambling and prostitution. The essential qualification for franchise was to be manual labour in his ideal society where power was decentralised. His ideal society was to be federal and secular. The Head of the state was to be a humble person. There were to be free elections. Gandhiji did not favour a complicated state structure. Jails were to serve as reformatories which were to give education and training to the prisoners who were to be considered as patients and jails as hospitals. Policemen were to believe in non-violence and behave as servants of the people and not their masters. The administration of justice was to be simple and cheap. The people in the ideal society were to believe in universal brotherhood. The purpose of the ideal society/state was to be the good of all (Sarvodaya) and not the greatest good of the greatest number. Nothing short of Sarvodaya was acceptable to Gandhiji as the purpose of the state.

The individual in the ideal state was to be the supreme consideration. Rural civilisation was to solve the basic problems of the people. Everybody was to get food and clothing and sufficient work to enable him to lead a simple and contented life. There were to be no monopolies and exploitation. Gandhiji believed that he who does not work, shall not eat. Economic classes and social status were to be abolished. The law of the brute was to be replaced by the law of man. There was to be equalization of status. "The working classes have all these centuries been isolated and relegated to a lower status. They have been Shoodras and the word has been interpreted to mean an inferior status. I want to allow no differentiation between a son of a weaver, of an agriculturist and of a school master."

As far as possible, every activity was to be conducted on a cooperative basis. The Government of the village was to be conducted by a Panchayat of five members, annually elected by adult villagers, males and females, possesing minimum prescribed qualifications. The Panchayats were to act as the legislature, executive and judiciary.

Mahatma Gandhi called his ideal society/state as Ram Raj or the kingdom of righteousness on earth. Ram Raj meant more than Swaraj or political self-government. It did not mean Hindu Raj. "I mean by Ram Raj divine Raj, the Kingdom of God. For Rama and Rahim are one and the same deity. I acknowledge no other God but the one God of truth and righteousness. Whether Rama of my imagination ever lived or not on this earth, the ancient ideal of Rama Raj is undoubtedly one of true democracy in which the meanest citizen could be sure of swift justice without an elaborate and costly procedure."

Referring to the criticism of the term Rama Raj for his ideal society, Gandhiji said, "It is a convenient and expressive phrase, the meaning of which no alternative can so fully express to millions. When I visit the Frontier Province or address pre-dominantly Muslim audience, I would express my meaning to them by calling it Khudai Raj, while to a Christian audience I would describe it as Kingdom of God on Earth." In 1937, Gandhiji described Rama Raj as sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority as distinguished from the British, Soviet or Nazi systems of rule.

Gandhiji held that "there can be no Rama Raj in the present state of iniquitous inequalities in which a few roll in riches and the masses do not get even enough to eat." Gandhiji looked beyond the present for the state that would belong to the people.

Rama Raj stands for an egalitarian, non-violent democratic order, with moral values forming the base of such an order. Whether this Utopia of Rama Raj is realizable through the methods advocated by Gandhiji, is a matter of controversy but the urge behind this vision can hardly be ignored.

Gandhiji on the State

According to Gandhiji, the state is not an end in itself but "one of the means of enabling people to better their condition in every department of life". The state is only one of the means to secure the good of all. There is nothing sacred about the actions of the state. The institution of the state is due to human weakness. Gandhiji distrusted the state and sought to develop in the people, through Satyagraha, the capacity to resist the state authority when it is abused. To quote him, "Real Swaraj will come not by the acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority when abused."

Gandhiji was not in favour of multiplying the functions of the state. He wanted them to be reduced to the minimum. Most of the functions of the state were to be transferred to the voluntary associations. To quote Gandhiji, "Self-Government means continuous effort to be independent of Government control, whether it is foreign or whether it is national. Swaraj Government will be a sorry affair if people look up to it for the regulation of every detail of life." Again, "I admit that there are certain things which cannot be done without political power, but there are numerous other things which do not at all depend upon political power. That is why a thinker like Thoreau said that that Government is the best which governs the least. This means that when people come into possession of political power, the interference with the freedom of the people is reduced to a minimum. In other words, a nation that runs its affairs smoothly and effectively without much state interference is truly democratic. Where such condition is absent, the form of Government is democratic only in name."

According to Gandhiji, the state is to perform its functions with the minimum use of coercion. It is to rule "through its moral authority based upon the greatest goodwill of the people." Both crime and coercion are to decrease in a non-violent state. That does not mean that crime is to disappear altogether. Gandhiji admitted that there may be some anti-social, parasitic individuals who may, due to lack of self-control, resort to violence and disobey laws. When a non-violent state is set up, there is the possibility of violent organisations trying to upset a non-violent Government. Under these circumstances, it becomes the duty of the Government to crush them. To quote him, "No Government can allow private military organisations to function without endangering public peace. A non-violent state cannot tolerate crimes and the degeneration of civil liberty to licence. No Government worth its name can allow anarchy to prevail in the country."

The power of the state to coerce is a kind of organised violence in

which lies the essence of the modern state. Gandhiji was repelled at the omnipotence and coercive character of the state. He was opposed to absolute and non-responsible power of the state. The state was to be judged by the qualities of its citizens whose moral development it can help or hinder. The view of Gandhiji was that "disobedience to the law of the state becomes a peremptory duty when it comes in conflict with the law of God." Gandhiji did not believe in obeying a law which was contrary to conscience. Submission to a state, wholly or largely unjust, is an immoral barter for liberty. Political power is not a command in itself but one of the means of enabling people to better their conditions in every department of life. This view of Gandhiji towards the state is opposed to the Hegelian view that the state is the embodiment of the greatness and glory and an expression of the Spirit or the Absolute. The view of Gandhiji was that the glorification of the sovereignty of the state was a challenge to the moral right of man to shape his own destiny. He believed in the "sovereignty of the people based on pure moral authority." It is true that Gandhiji had preference for self-reliance and voluntarism but even his theory of trusteeship does not exclude legislative regulation of the ownership and use of property. He was opposed to the absolute sovereignty of the state as promulgated by Hobbes, Austin and Hegel. His opposition to state sovereignty may be presumed to be based on the following grounds: (1) his metaphysical belief in the primacy of spiritual authority over temporal authority, (2) his faith in the inner moral conscience of the individual as superior to the organised might of the state, and (3) his belief in the sovereignty of the people based on moral authority as against the organised power system of the legal sovereign.

Gandhiji regarded the individual as the centre of authority and value. He was categorical in his view of the relation between the individual and the state. To quote him, "Ultimately it is individual which is the unit". The state and Government derive their existence and power from the individuals. This view of the ultimate authority of the individual paved the way for the theory of non-violent non-cooperation with the state.

In 1916, Gandhiji called himself an Anarchist but of another type which was different from the violent revolutionaries or terrorists. He wrote thus in 1931 : "If national life becomes so perfect as to become self-regulated, no representation becomes necessary. There is then a state of enlightened anarchy. In such a state, every one is his own ruler. He rules himself in such a manner that he is never a hindrance to neighbour. In the ideal state, therefore, there is no politcial power because there is no state. But the ideal is never fully realised in life. Hence the classical statement of Thoreau that that Government is the best which governs the least". In the same year, Gandhiji was asked whether a state could carry on strictly according to the principle of non-violence and his reply was in these words : "A Government cannot succeed in becoming entirely non-violent because it represents all the people. I do not today conceive of such a golden age. But I do believe in the possibility of a predominantly non-violent society and I am working for it." In 1946, Gandhiji wrote, "There remains the question as to whether in an ideal society, there should be any or no Government. I do not think we need worry ourselves about this at this moment. If we continue to work for such a society, it will slowly come into being to an exetnt, such that the people can benefit by

it. Euclid's line is one without breadth but no one has so far been able to draw it and never will. All the same it is only by keeping the ideal line in mind that we have made progress in geometry. What is true here is true of every ideal."

Gandhiji's ultimate political ideal was stateless democracy. It was a model to strive for and not a goal that could be achieved. As the "Golden Age" was far off, Gandhiji worked for the realisation of a "predominantly non-violent society." Gandhiji believed not in the perfection but in the perfectibility of man. Dr. G. N. Dhawan writes, "The ideal non-violent society of Gandhiji, unattainable due to human imperfection, indicates the direction rather than the destination, the process rather than the consummation. The structure of the state that will emerge as a result of non-violent revolution will be a compromise, a via media, between the ideal non-violent society and the facts of human nature. It will be the attainable 'middle way' of Gandhiji, the first step after the revolution towards the ideal."

As the ultimate ideal of purest anarchy or stateless society was unattainable, Gandhiji's thought was moving in the direction of the evolution of a pre-dominantly non-violent state. In 1940, Gandhiji himself used the term "non-violent state". Dr. G. N. Dhawan writes, "By a non-violent state we mean the state that is predominantly non-violent. A state depending as it does more or less on coercion is the negation of non-violence. The completely non-violent state would no longer be a state. It would then be the Stateless Society and society can be Stateless when it is completely or almost completely non-violent. This is an ideal that may not be fully realised. What we may get in actual practice may be a pre-dominantly non-violent state advancing towards, though perhaps never reaching, the Stateless stage."

A question has been raised whether Gandhiji was an anarchist or not. The view of Dr. G. N. Dhawan is that Gandhiji was a philosophical Anarchist. To quote him, "To Gandhiji the end is the greatest good of all. He is a philosophical Anarchist because he believes that this end can be realised only in the classless, stateless democracy of autonomous village communities based on non-violence instead of coercion, on service instead of exploitation, on renunciation instead of acquisitiveness and on the largest measure of local and individual initiative instead of centralisation. Gandhiji, ideally speaking, repudiates the state as such." Gandhiji has often been described as a religious Anarchist or a pacifist Anarchist like Tolstoy.

The view of Dr. Binoy Sarkar is that Gandhiji was "an almost literal paraphraser of Tolstoy as regards denunciation of the state and advocacy of non-violence." P. Spratt refused to call Gandhiji an Anarchist. Dr. B. B. Majumdar writes, "Mahatma Gandhi condemned the existing social and political order as unjust and he opposed the centralising policy of the state but he never advocated the destruction of the state itself." The view of Dr. Power is that "unlike Tolstoy, Gandhiji did not endorse a stateless society for the temporal world. To do so would have precluded him from struggling for national India's own sovereignty." The view of Dr. J. V. Bondurant is that Gandhiji held essential ideals in common with the anarchists but he was willing to accept a degree of state oganisation and

control which the Anarchists did not. Gandhiji could not accept the overall philosophical anarchist position.

According to Dr. Atindranath Bose, Gandhiji dreamt of an enlightened anarchy and led the movement for the establishment of a free democratic state. Unlike some Anarchists, Gandhiji did not contemplate dispensing with the machinery of the state so long as it was a necessity. His concession in favour of state ownership of heavy industries brought him close to the socialist programme. While the Anarchists are apolitical or even anti-political, Gandhiji was intensely political. As the champion of the disinherited, he was interested in giving priority to the interests of the toiling people in such a state. Prof. Nirmal Kumar Bose writes, "Gandhiji's conception of the state is neither completely like that of the Anarchists nor of the Communists. It approaches the former with regard to its aim of political and economic decentralisation and that of the latter in that the interest of the toiling millions will have a dictatorial position within the state."

Gandhiji believed in communal harmony and hence the necessity of a secular state. The state of his conception could not be a theocratic state. In 1924, he said that it was unpatriotic even to nurse a dream of Hindu Raj. In 1947, he maintained that "the state should undoubtedly be secular. Everyone living in it should be entitled to profess his religion without let or hindrance, so long as the citizen obeyed the common law of the land. There would be no interference with missionary effort, but no mission could enjoy the patronage of the state." Gandhiji's view was that religion is a personal matter and should have no place in politics.

Swaraj (Freedom)

Gandhiji employed the term Swaraj in its specific and generic sense. While he organised the Indian masses for Swaraj conceived as a constitutional, democratic political order, he also stressed its economic or organic content. He enunciated his ideal of Swaraj for the first time in his book entitled "Hind Swaraj". He wrote in 1924, "Swaraj for me means freedom for the meanest of our countrymen. I am not interested in freeing India merely from the English yoke. I am bent upon freeing India from any yoke whatsoever. I have no desire to exchange King Log for King Stork".

Gandhiji wrote in 1930, "The Swaraj of my dream recognises no race or religious distinctions. Nor it is to be the monopoly of the lettered persons nor yet of moneyed men. Swaraj is to be for all, including the farmer but emphatically including the maimed, the blind, the starving toiling millions." He also wrote in 1931, "The Swaraj of my dream is the poor man's Swaraj. The necessaries of life should be enjoyed by you in common with those enjoyed by the princes and the moneyed men but that does not mean that you should have palaces like theirs. They are not necessary for happiness. You and I would be lost in them. But you ought to get all the ordinary amenities of life that a rich man enjoys. I have not the slightest doubt that Swaraj is not purna Swaraj until these amenities are guaranteed to you under it."

On the eve of his voyage to England in 1931, Gandhiji wrote, "It

has been said that Indian Swaraj will be the rule of the majority community, i.e., the Hindus. There could not be a greater mistake than that. If it were to be true, I for one would refuse to call it Swaraj and would fight it with all the strength at my command, for to me Hind Swaraj is the rule of all the people, is the rule of justice. Whether under that rule the ministers were Hindus or Musalmans or Sikhs and whether the legislatures were exclusively filled by the Hindus or Musalmans or any other community, they would have to do even-handed justice. And just as no community in India need have any fear of Swaraj being monopolised by any other, even so the English should have no fear. I may tell you that the Congress does not belong to any particular group of men; it belongs to all."

It was Gandhiji who for the first time in Indian history gave a mass or democratic orientation to the concept of freedom. Political independence alone did not satisfy him. His politics was not power-oriented. The essence of his concept of Swaraj was that power must belong to the people. He wanted the people at large to be sovereign. Gandhiji always insisted on poor man's or people's Swaraj. Real Swaraj could be established by awakening the masses into a sense of their power and dignity. That could be achieved through non-violent non-cooperation and not violent revolution. Non-violent struggle would elevate the masses to a new sense of dignity and enable them to stand up to any authority if power was abused.

The true Swaraj of Gandhiji was a multi-class Swaraj and no class or stratum of society was to be excluded. It is true that Gandhiji had an inclination towards the toiling masses but his Swaraj was an all-class state.

Gandhiji's ideal of the rule of all or rule of justice is criticised on the ground that the rule of all the people is an amorphous term. The state is not above classes. However, Gandhiji did not approach the problem of power from a class point of view. P. Spratt writes, "Gandhian scheme would not depend solely upon the interests of a class. It could probably mobilise both nationalistic and revolutionary idealism and idealism is no less important than class interest."

Gandhiji's stress on the people as the ultimate repository and wielder of power carried a new note at a time when political freedom was conceived of as an end in itself. In the sense of giving a new jolt to the conventional way of political thinking, it was a great departure and Gandhiji's concept of people's Swaraj or poor man's Swaraj bears an impress of its own.

Personal and Civic Freedom

Gandhiji upheld the dignity and authority of the individual throughout his life. He advocated and fought for the recognition of civic freedom. As a true democrat, he upheld the principle of freedom of opinion. "Public opinion alone can keep a society pure and healthy. There can be no public opinion without free press, free platform, association etc." Gandhiji wrote in 1922, "Liberty of speech means that it is unassailed even when the speech hurts; liberty of the press can be said to be truly respected only when the press can comment in the severest terms upon and even misrepresent matters, protection against misrepresentation or violence being

secured not by an administrative gagging order, not by closing down the press but by punishing the real offender, leaving the press itself unrestricted. Freedom of association is truly respected when assemblies of people can discuss even revolutionary projects, the state relying upon the force of public opinion and the civil police, not the savage military at its disposal, to crush any actual outbreak of revolution that is designed to confound public opinion and the state representing it."

Even during the World War II, Gandhiji pleaded for freedom of speech. He wrote in 1940, "I claim the liberty of going through the streets of Bombay and say that I shall have nothing to do with this war and in this fratricide that is going on in Europe." Again, "Freedom of speech and corresponding action is the breath of democratic life. Freedom of propagating non-violence as substitute for war is the most relevant when indecent savagery is being perpetrated by the warring nations of Europe." Again, "Freedom of speech and pen is the foundation of Swaraj. If foundation-stone is in danger, you have to exert the whole of your might in order to defend that single stone."

Gandhiji's view of freedom was all-inclusive—political, economic, social and moral. He called this as "the square of Swaraj". He conceived life as an organic whole. He maintained that fearlessness was necessary not only for attaining freedom but also for maintaining it.

Rights and Duties

Gandhiji advocated both rights and duties. As a matter of fact, he put more emphasis on duties than on rights. According to him, the right to perform one's duties is the only right that is worth fighting for and dying for. It covers all legitimate rights. If a right is demanded or recognised without the claimant possessing the capacity to perform the corresponding duty, the purpose of the right is not attained and the right cannot be sustained. There is no right without a corresponding duty and vice versa. Rights accrue only to that person who serves the state to which he belongs. To quote Gandhiji, "The true source of right is duty. If we all discharge our duties, rights will not be far to seek. If leaving duties unperformed, we run after rights, they will escape us like a will of the wisp. The more we pursue them, the further they will fly".

Gandhiji wrote in 1931 that every man had an equal right to the necessaries of life. As every right carries with it a corresponding duty, it is merely a matter of finding out the corresponding duties and remedies to vindicate the elementary fundamental equality. Gandhiji said in 1939, "Rights accrue automatically to him who duly performs his duties. In fact the right to perform one's duties is the only right that is worth living for and dying for. It covers all legitimate rights." Gandhiji wrote to H. G. Wells that he should start with a charter of duties of man and rights will follow as spring follows winter. In 1947, Gandhiji told Julian Huxley that all rights to be deserved and preserved come from duty well done. The very right to live accrues to us only when we do the duty of citizenship of the world.

Gandhiji was the champion of the rights of the racially humiliated, colonially subjugated and economically dispossessed humanity. His theory

of Satyagraha was based on the fact that every individual has the inalienable right to resist a coercive social and political system. In all his activities, there is a desire that all should have their rights. Both in South Africa and India, Gandhiji advocated the cause of individual conscience against the orders of the state.

Equality

Gandhiji was a great champion of equality in its comprehensive sense. He stood for political, economic, social and racial equality. However, equality did not mean dead uniformity. Equality implied equal opportunity for every one for the full flowering of his individuality.

Gandhiji fought against racial inequality in South Africa. He also fought against social inequality in the form of untouchability in India. He devoted the whole of his life for the removal of untouchability which was the source of social inequality. Gandhiji stood both for economic and social equality. To quote him, "I want to bring about an equalization of status. The working classes have all these centuries been isolated and relegated to a lower status. They have been Shoodras and the word has been interpreted to mean an inferior status. I want to allow no differentiation between the son of a weaver, of an agriculturist and of a schoolmaster."

Gandhiji believed in equality of men and women. Women must have votes and an equal legal status. Gandhiji was in favour of legislation aimed at removing inequalities between man and woman. He wanted the enlightened women of India to fight against all those laws which were based on social discrimination. He was of the view that rules of social conduct must be framed by cooperation and consultation and can never be imposed from outside.

Democracy

Gandhiji believed in genuine democracy which could be established only on the basis of unadulterated Ahimsa or non-violence. According to him, democracy and violence were incompatible. Both democracy and non-violence were only means and the end was to attain and establish a universal community of human beings which shall be peaceful, happy and progressive in the physical, intellectual, moral and spiritual fields. The people were to have full scope to attain the highest they were capable of.

Gandhiji criticised Western parliamentary democracies in countries like Britain, France and the United States. He wrote in 1925 that "The peoples of Europe have no doubt political power but no Swaraj." In 1939, he wrote, "Democracy of the West is, in my opinion, only so-called. It has germs in it certainly of the true type. But it can only come when violence is eschewed and malpractices disappear." Again, "Democracy and violence can ill go together. The states that are today nominally democratic have either to become frankly totalitarian or, if they are to become truly democratic, they must become courageously non-violent." Gandhiji wrote in 1939, "The democracies, therefore, that we see at work in England, Aemrica and France are only so-called because they are no less based on violence than Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy or even Soviet Russia. The only

Gandhiji wrote in 1931, "Our nationalism can be no peril to other nations in as much as we will exploit none, just as we will allow none to exploit us. Through Swaraj we will serve the whole world." He wrote in 1933, "I am a humble servant of India and in trying to serve India, I serve humanity at large. After nearly 50 years of public life, I am able to say that today my faith in the doctrine that the service of one's nation is not inconsistent with the service of the world has grown. It is a good doctrine. Its acceptance alone will ease the situation in the world and stop the mutual jealousies between nations inhabiting this globe of ours."

According to Gandhiji, there was no anti-thesis between nationalism and internationalism. He did not preach abstract internationalism. His view was that one must be a good nationalist in order to become a true internationalist. There can be no genuine international cooperation without national independence. To quote him, "It is impossible for one to be an internationalist without being a nationalist. Internationalism is possible only when nationalism becomes a fact, i.e., when peoples belonging to different countries have organised themselves and are able to act as one man. It is not nationalism that is evil, it is narrowness, selfishness, exclusiveness which is the bane of modern nations which is evil. Each wants to profit at the expense of, and rise on the ruins of, the other. Indian nationalism has struck a different path. It wants to organize itself or to find full self-expression for the benefit and service of humanity at large.. God having cast my lot in the midst of the people of India, I should be untrue to my Maker if I failed to serve them. If I do not know how to serve them I shall never know how to serve humanity. And I cannot possibly go wrong so long as I do not harm other nations in the act of serving my country."

Gandhiji wrote in 1924 that "isolated independence is not the goal of the world states. It is voluntary independence." Again, "The better mind of the world desires today not absolutely independent states warring against one another, but a federation of friendly independent states." Dr. Dhirendra Mohan Datta observes: "Indian nationalism drew its inspiration from the dominant Indian belief in the fundamental unity of humanity in spite of its diversity, and the consequent belief in the reasonableness of human equality. So nationalism logically led on to internationalism. Love of man impelled Gandhi to be both a nationalist and an internationalist."

Imperialism and Fascism

To begin with, Gandhiji's attitude towards imperialism was not hostile. He had faith in the British Empire and he considered it his duty to help that Empire. That is why he helped the British Empire during the Zulu War. He also helped the British Government when the World War I started in 1914. However, his ideas were changed on account of racial discrimination practised by the colonialists in South Africa. From 1920 onwards, he became a great critic of British imperialism. To quote him, "I consider the existing system of Government to be wholly bad and requiring special national effort to end or mend it. It does not possess within itself capacity for self-improvement."

Gandhiji's view was that the philosophy of Nazism and Fascism was

based on the premise of the sacrifice of the individual at the altar of the nation or the state. He denounced Nazism and Fascism in very strong terms.

Gandhiji said in 1939 that his sympathies were wholly with the Allies but that did not mean his endorsement, in any shape or form, of the doctrine of the sword for the defence of even proven right.

Socialism

In the words of Gandhiji, "Socialism is a beautiful word and so far as I am aware, in socialism all the members of the society are equal—none low, none high. In the individual body the head is not high because it is the top of body nor are the soles of the feet low because they touch the earth. Even as the parts of the body are equal, so are the members of the society. This is socialism".

Dr. S. C. Gupta writes, "Gandhian idea in general and Gandhian socialism in particular is no mere theory, not merely an intellectual grasp or philosophical satisfaction which can be attained by simple speculation and thinking."

War

The view of J. B. Kripalani was that "Gandhi was not a pacifist in the accepted sense of the term". Prof. Tsurumi writes, "Gandhiji was not a mere lover of peace, justice and human compassion but he was a militant pacifist of outstanding courage and fearlessness."

There was an evolution in the views of Gandhiji on war. He took part in the Zulu War. This he did out of his genuine sense of loyalty towards the British Empire. The Indians made a special appeal to the White colonists "to make use of, for purposes of war, one hundred thousand Indians who are perfectly loyal and who are capable of good training." However, there developed a sort of disillusionment with British imperialism in the mind of Gandhiji. To quote him, "The British Government in India constitutes a struggle between the Modern Civilization which is Kingdom of Satan and the Ancient Civilization which is the Kingdom of God. The one is God of War, the other is the God of Love." Gandhiji considered war as a degrading and brutalising instrument of politics.

During the World War I, Gandhiji raised recruits in India as he had raised an ambulance corps in London in 1914. His view was that England's need should not be turned into an opportunity for India. He hoped to improve his status and that of his people through the British Empire. In his letter dated 30 April 1918 addressed to the Viceroy of India, Gandhiji stated that in the hour of its danger, the Indians were giving ungrudging and unequivocal support to the British Empire in the expectation that they will become partners in the same sense as the Dominions overseas.

Some pacifists have criticised Gandhiji for having participated in the Bóer War, Zulu War and the World War I. The main charge is that Gandhiji deviated from the strict principle of Ahimsa and he preferred expediency and subordinated the principle to the interests of the former. However, Gandhiji justified his action in his reply to the critics.

Gandhiji wished success to the Spanish Republicans fighting against

General Franco, the Chinese struggling against Japan and the Poles resisting Germany. About the oppression of the Jews by the Nazis of Germany, Gandhiji wrote, "If ever there could be a justifiable war in the name of and for humanity, a war against Germany to prevent the wanton persecution of a whole race, would be completely justified. But I do not believe in any war."

Gandhiji told Louis Fischer on 5 June 1943, "Britain and America and other countries too can keep their armies here and use Indian territory as a base for military operations. I do not want Japan to win the war. I do not want the Axis to win." In his letter dated 14 June 1942 addressed to Chiang Kai-Shek, Gandhiji made clear that India wanted to prevent Japanese aggression in every way.

After the Independence of India, Gandhiji expressed his appreciation of the action of the Government of India in rushing troops for the defence of Kashmir in October 1947. He said that he would not mind if the whole of the military and the people of Kashmir died at their posts in defence of Kashmir.

Peace

Gandhiji is often described as an apostle of peace. He worked hard for peace and died for peace. He advocated peace but not peace at any price. He did not stand for the peace of the grave. He wanted peace with justice. He advocated non-violent and just peace which alone could ensure lasting peace.

When Mussolini attacked Abyssinia, Gandhiji expressed his sympathy for the people of Abyssinia. The view of Gandhiji was that if the recognised leaders of mankind who had control over the engines of destruction, were to renounce their use completely, with full knowldge of its implications, permanent peace could be attained.

The traditional solutions for preventing aggression are abritration, world Government, international organisation, disarmanent and world peace and defence force. However, Gandhiji preferred the method of arbitration. Gandhiji's view was that "peace cannot be established through mere conferences". The professed declaration of the League of Nations to enforce peace was, at its best, a little more than a gesture and at its worst, a device of hoodwinking the war-weary world.

Gandhiji recommended total disarmament, whether unilateral or multilateral. He did not approve of the plea for progressive disarmament. He was optimistic enough to advocate unilateral disarmament. The quote him, "If even one great nation were unconditionally to perform the supreme act of renunciation, many of us would see in our life-time visible peace established on earth."

The view of Gandhiji was that disarmament was possible only through "the matchless weapon of non-violence." He hoped that "India will prove herself worthy of being the first nation in the world" to give a lead to the other nations for the delivery of the earth from the burden of war.

Gandhiji advocated Satyagraha as the sure and potent weapon of combating inter-state aggression. According to him, "Satyagraha was univer-

sally applicable. Non-violence excluded war and ushered in peace." Gandhiji stood for a non-violent and non-exploitative social order which alone could ensure a just and enduring peace.

Economic Thought of Gandhiji

In the words of V. K. Bhattacharya, "In recent times, Gandhiji was the only politician, nay social thinker who was capable to present a complete economic theory. Unlike Marx, his economic thought is all-embracing. It is based on a practical philosophy of his own and covers all the problems that plague our social life." The economic ideas of Gandhiji were very much influenced by Ruskin, Tolstoy, Ramakrishna Paramhansa and Vivekananda.

Gandhiji gave a moral approach to economic problems. He put great emphasis on the ethical aspect of economic problmes. Marx put emphasis on class-struggle but Gandhiji put emphasis on close coordination. Marx stood for violent methods to solve the problem of economic inequality. Gandhiji believed that the same could be done by the introduction of moral standards in economics. Gandhiji condemned materialism and advocated simplicity and a religious life. He wanted the people to give up their craze for accumulating more wealth. He wanted the rich to give up their riches peacefully. Instead of greed, people should cultivate the habits of generosity and love. The labourers must be given a fair daily wage. Work should become worship and not drudgery.

In order to solve the problem of economic inequality, Gandhiji put forward his scheme of trusteeship. His contention was that "everything belonged to God and was from God. Therefore it was for his people as a whole, not for a particular individual. When an individual had more than his proportionate portion, he became a trustee of that portion of God's people".

Gandhiji did not advocate the confiscation of the properties of the rich. He wanted them to earn more and more but after satisfying their reasonable needs, the balance must be held by them as trustees of the people. The Government was to fix the amount they could keep to themselves and the rest as the trustees of the people. Those who were brilliant must use all their brilliance to earn more but they were not to keep to themselves anything more than what was necessary for the satisfaction of their reasonable needs. Trusteeship was intended to provide a means of transforming the capitalistic order of society into an egalitarian one. It gave the rich a chance to reform themselves. It did not recognise any right of ownership of property except what was given to the individual by the society or the state. Gandhiji made it clear that if the rich themselves did not accept this offer of trusteeship, the Government may be forced to pass a law by which their properties could be confiscated.

According to Gandhiji, equality was one of the important features of non-violent democratic society. There could not be a non-violent social order if the difference between the rich and the poor was very great. Gandhiji opposed the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few. He did not like millions to be starving and a few having too much of wealth. He stood for the principle of equitable distribution of wealth. Each individual was entitled to get what he needed provided his needs were natural.

In the ideal state of Gandhiji, the daily wages of lawyers, doctors, and teachers were to be the same. The talented people were to put in their best and earn more for the sake of society. To quote Gandhiji, "While we are born equal....we have a right to equal opportunity although we do not have the same capacity. It is in the nature of things impossible. For instance, all cannot have the same brightness or colour or degree of intelligence etc. Therefore, in the nature of things, some will have ability to earn more and others less. People with talents will have more and they will utilise their talents for this purpose. If they utilise their talents kindly, they will be performing the work of the state. Such people exist as trustees. I would allow a man of intellect to earn more, I would not cramp his talent. But the bulk of his greater earnings must be used for the good of the state, just as the income of all earning sons of the father go to the common family fund. They would have their earnings only as trustees." Again, "My ideal is equal distribution but so far as I can see, it is not to be realised. I therefore work for equitable distribution."

Gandhiji was an advocate of cottage industries. He believed that the poverty of the people could be lessened if they were given work for their spare time so that they could earn. It appared to him that was the only way to rehabilitate the people of the villages. Asoka Mehta writes, "Khadi for Gandhiji was the natural nexus between physical and mental labour, bridge between brain and brawn. Spinning of course could help to put the idle days of miserably poor peasants to productive use. Khadi to him was the symbol of production by the masses as distinct from mass production".

To begin with, Gandhiji put more emphasis on weaving. Later on, he realised that there could be no weaving unless there was thread for weaving. Hence Gandhiji put emphasis both on handlooms and spinning. In order to produce more thread for spinning, Gandhiji took lots of pain to devise such a Charkha or the spinning wheel. The main emphasis was to help the poor who were otherwise wasting their spare time, to earn more money for their livelihood. Anthony Paul writes, "Gandhi's use of the spinning wheel has been much misunderstood. In reality, it was a means whereby the poor villagers of India could do something to help themselves in the conditions immediately available to them. It was also a means whereby the rich classes could identify themselves in some measure at least with their poor brothers. Gandhiji also intended a moral transformation. He did not view the Charkha as a symbol of the rejection of industrialisation."

Gandhiji was also an advocate of Swadeshi. He wanted the people of India to use the goods produced in their own country. This programme was considered necessary on account of the monopoly of the British goods in Indian markets. To quote Gandhiji, "Swadeshi is a religious discipline to be undergone in utter disregard of the physical discomfort it may cause to individuals. A Swadeshist will learn to do without hundreds of things which today he considers necessary." Gandhiji advocated Swadeshi as he wanted to protect the Indian industries against competition from foreign goods, particularly from England. Gandhiji justified his action in these words, "It is in no sense narrow, for I buy from every part of the world what is needed for my growth. I refuse to buy from anybody anything, however nice or beautiful, if it interferes with my growth or injures those

whom nature has made my first care." C. F. Andrews writes that Khadi "offers an immediate, practicable and permanent solution of the poblem of idleness owing to lack of a suitable occupation supplementary to agriculture and the chronic starvation of the masses that results therefrom".

Gandhiji was opposed to the introduction of labour-saving machinery in India. His view was that the problem of India was to find employment for those who had no work to do and not to render unemployed more persons as a result of the introduction of machinery to do the work which was previously done by the workers. To quote Gandhiji, "What I object to is the craze for machinery, not machinery as such. The craze is for what they call labour-saving machinery. Men go on saving labour till thousands are without work and thrown on the open street to die of starvation. Today machinery merely helps a few to ride on the backs of millions. The impetus behind it all is not philanthropy to save labour but greed." Gandhiji was not opposed to machinery as such but he contended that more machinery should not be employed if that was going to result in making more people unemployed. He was in favour of the state taking over those industries which were producing goods of primary need. "But I am socialist enough to say that such factories should be nationalised. They ought only to be working under the most attractive conditions, not for profit, but for the benefit of humanity, love taking the place of greed, as the motive power." Again, "Machinery has its place; it has come to stay. I am aiming not at the eradication of all machinery but its limitation. What I object to is the craze for machinery, not the machinery as such."

The view of Gandhiji was that the village economy in India was ruined during the British regime and hence it was necessary to rehabilitate the same. His view was that rual uplift was essential if the standard of life of the people was to be raised. Gandhiji was very unhappy regarding the miserable condition of the people living in villages. He formulated a constructive programme which contained such things as communal harmony, removal of untouchability, prohibition, Khadi, rural industries, village sanitation, basic education, uplift of women, propagation of national language, economic equality etc.

The view of Gandhiji was that the following of such a programme was in the interests of the people. Village reconstruction alone could bring about the regenration of India and revitalize Indian democracy. To quote Gandhiji, "Over 75 per cent of the population are agriculturists. But there cannot be much spirit of self-Government about us if we take away from them almost the whole of the results of their labour."

Gandhiji also believed in the limitation of the needs of the people. He believed that only that person could be happy who had limited his wants. To quote him, "Increase of material comforts does not in any way whatsoever, conduce to moral growth." Dr. B. S. Sharma writes, "Thus limitation of wants to necessities and economic decentralisation are the chief considerations behind the economic structure which Gandhi would like to see. This ideal Gandhi finds fulfilled in the pattern of village economy based on agriculture and cottage industries."

Gandhiji's view was that all wealth is socially produced. No Robinson Crusoe on a solitary island can produce wealth. Therefore, Gandhiji held

that socially produced wealth must be equally divided among all those who are instrumental in producing it. If this is too idealistic a view, socially produced wealth must be equitably divided. To quote Gandhiji, "According to me the economic constitution of India and for that matter of the world, should be such that no one under it should suffer from want of food and clothing. In other words, everybody should be able to get sufficient work to enable him to make the two ends meet. And this ideal can be universally realised only if the means of production of the elementary necessaries of life remain in the control of the masses. They should be freely available to all as God's air and water are or ought to be....Their monopolisation by any country, nation or groups of persons would be unjust. The neglect of this simple principle is the cause of the destitution that we witness today not only in this unhappy land but in other parts of the world too".

Gandhiji was against the exploitation of the poor by the capitalist, whether foreign or Indian. In the case of Ahmedabad, he supported the strike of the textile labourers against the mill-owners. He started his campaign in Champaran against the exploitation of the cultivators by the planters. He was against the physical liquidation of the capitalists and the Zamindars but their exploitation had to be ended. He believed that that could be done if the landlords and the capitalists acted as trustees of the poor. His doctrine of trusteeship applied to all spheres of life. The parents act as trustees for their children. The Government acts or should act as a trustee of the people. The representatives of the people in a democracy are the trustees of those who chose them as members of a legislature. Even in a dictatorship, the dictator justifies his arbitrary power on the ground that he is the trustee of the people. The Communist Party considers itself as the guardian of the interests of the proletariat. Talking to the textile mill labourers in Ahmedabad, Gandhiji told them that they were the real masters of the mills. Their labour was more precious than the wealth of the capitalists. Gandhiji advised the labourers and the cultivators to offer Satyagraha to assert their rights.

Gandhiji had to take into consideration all these factors to devise a method by which the grinding poverty of the Indian masses could be mitigated, if not altogether removed. The only way was to revive the Swadeshi movement. The chief article that the villager needed was cloth and Gandhiji took up the production of cloth as the first industry to be tackled. In the beginning, he thought only in terms of weaving and put up looms in his Ashram at Sabarmati. Soon he found that spinning was also necessary and he put all the emphasis on the Charkha which could produce a lot of yarn. Gandhiji was criticised by many intellectuals in India for his efforts to revive cottage and village industries in modern times but his reply was in these words : "Whatever the mechanical age may do, it will never give employment to millions whom the wholesale introduction of power machinery now displaces." Again, "A starving man or woman who has the time hanging on his or her hands will be glad to earn an honest anna during that time."

Gandhiji was not against the development of science. He was also not against technology. He had no objection to the use of mechanised power to increase production and diminish the drudgery of workers. The only

condition was that such mechanical power must be available to every village who wanted to use it. He did not want science and machinery to produce goods and starve men. For him the superior consideration was man.

Social Reform

Gandhiji was not only a politician but also a great social reformer. He put great emphasis on constructive work. He did not believe that the imperial ambitions of Great Britain alone were responsible for India's slavery. According to him, it was the neglect of national duty that was primarily responsible for it. A constructive programme was devised by Gandhiji to reform the national character of the people of India.

Gandhiji put geat emphasis on the abolition of untouchability. It was a cruel and inhuman institutuion. It violated human dignity. It deadened the sensibility of both the oppressor and the oppressed. It was against the spirit of democracy which made no distinction among citizens. It raised economic problems. The untouchables were the poorest section of Indian society. Their avenues of employment were strictly limited. They lived in unhygienic surroundings. Though they were Hindus and believed in and worshipped Hindu gods and goddesses, they were not allowed to enter Hindu temples. Public institutions like schools, hotels etc. were closed to them. Gandhiji rightly felt that they who denied justice to those who suffered injustice at their hands, had no right to demand justice for themselves from their oppressors.

Gandhiji called upon the caste Hindus to make all the sacrifices necessary for the abolition of untouchability. By doing so, they would be rendering only belated justice for the grievous injury inflicted by their ancestors on the untouchables through the centuries. Gandhiji set up the Harijan Sevak Sangh which was to work for the removal of the disabilities of the Harijans. In September 1932, Gandhiji undertook a fast to get the Communal Award given by the Prime Minister of England changed so that the Harijans were not separated from the Hindus. While in Delhi, Gandhiji insisted on living in the Bhangi colony where all the dignitaries, British or Indian, had to go to meet him and where many important meetings of the Congress Working Committee were held.

Gandhiji believed in a policy of prohibition and wanted the Government to take strong action in this direction so that the people could be saved from the dangerous consequences of drinking. He justified his stand in these words: "Let it be remembered that this drink and drugs revenue is a form of extremely degrading taxation. All taxation to be healthy must return tenfold to the tax-payer in the form of necessary services. Excise makes people pay for their own corruption, moral, mental and physical. It falls like a dead-weight on those who are least able to bear it. The loss of revenue is only apparent. Removal of this degarding tax enables the drinker i.e., the tax-payer to earn and spend better. Apart, therefore, from this tremondous gain, it means a substantial economic gain to the nation."

Sarvodaya

In the words of Dr. A. Appadorai, "The concept of Sarvodaya is the

most original contemporary attempt at an Indian contribution to political thought. It owes its origin to M. K. Gandhi and has been developed by Vinoba Bhave and J. P. Narayan".

Gandhiji coined the term Sarvodaya in 1904 while trying to paraphrase Ruskin's "Unto This Last". The good of the individual is contained in the good of all. The work of a lawyer has the same value as that of a barber. A life of labour is life worth-living.

Sarvodaya is the Gandhian panacea for modern socio-economic ills from which the world is suffering today. Its central problem is to reconcile the demands of egoism and altruism. It demands the transformation of egocentric outlook into altruistic outlook. The change is to be brought from within and not from without and that also by means of persuasion.

Sarvodaya aims at creating a high moral atmosphere in the country. That is to be achieved by following the Gandhian principles of truth, non-violence and purity of means. The power of the people called Lok Shakti is to be developed.

Self-sacrifice is the essence of Sarvodaya. Every individual is to be ready and willing to sacrifice his happiness for the sake of others. Every one is to follow the policy of giving and not taking. He is to work for others and not expect anything in return for the same.

Gandhiji wanted to rebuild the nation "from the bottom upwards" and establsih a new social order based on freedom, justice, equality and fraternity. He preferred to have a democratic state. He defined democracy as the art and science of mobilising the entire physical, economic and spiritual resources of all the various sections of the people in the service of the common good of all. He deliberately defined the term in order to make it comprehensive and give equal opportunity to one and all. For realising the aims of democracy, he prescribed the instrument of non-violence. The aim of Gandhiji was to enlist the support of the intelligentsia to win freedom and establish a new democratic state.

Gandhiji said. "Swaraj of my dream is the poor man's Swaraj". That shows that Gandhiji was a proletarian democrat. According to Gandhiji, democracy requires the reduction of the possibility of abuse of power to a minimum. Real democracy can come only from within and that also spontaneously.

Gandhiji did not like centralisation and concentration of power. He believed in rebuilding the nation from the bottom upwards to a point where a changed society would be ready to march behind its leaders. That would be in essence a non-violent society. There would be no group conflicts and coercion. Persons professing different religious faiths will be able to live together. There would be communal harmony and toleration. It would be free from the injustice of one sex towards the other. There would be the emancipation of women.

As large-scale capitalism involved oppression, class-war, there was to be as little of it as possible. Where it had to exist, it was to be diffused by a system of bringing together management and labour. The people were to be delivered from wage slavery altogether. Such a deliverance for most of the people of India lay in cottage industries and manual labour.

The spinning wheel was the key to unlock all such doors and the bond of brotherhood that united all Indians.

The view of Gandhiji was that the existing state, being an organ of privilege and coercion, will not allow a new social order to be created. In his opinion, a cooperative federation of village republics was better than any existing state. Gandhiji did not approve of the imposition of the majority rule on the minority. Cooperative federation of village republics was to be based on non-violence and the true tenets of democracy where the majority would work with the minority to arrive at formulae for resolving disputes and promoting the welfare of one and all. The result would be "not the greatest good of the greatest number" but the "good of all or Sarvodaya".

There would be no untouchability or unemployment. There would be equality and emancipation. There would be communal harmony between the Hindus and Muslims. There would be no evils of communalism and casteism. The people would be free from unrighteousness and would keep themselves away from drinks and drugs. There would be no exploitation. There would be no poverty nor human degradation. The people would enjoy freedom and live happily.

Gandhiji was so much satisfied with his new idea of Sarvodaya that he began expounding it in Young India and Navajivan. He went to the extent of training a cadre of selfless, disciplined, dedicated and patriotic youths to implement it. So long as Gandhiji lived, he tried to establish a democratic state and a new social order.

Sarvodaya puts emphasis on villages and stands for their rehabilitation. Village is the bulwark of Indian life. We must direct our attention from cities to villages. The villagers have to be given more than what they have got today. They have been exploited for long and that must end now. The people are to elect the members of the village Panchayats on non-party basis and village Panchayats are to elect members of Thana Panchayats. Likewise, other elections have to be held indirectly.

Gandhiji condemned political parties, professional politicians, elections, majority rule, hasty legislation and centralisation of power. Parties made the people crazy for power. There is rush for party tickets which usually go to the rich people who use their position in the legislatures for their selfish ends. Elections are compared to tuberculosis and leaders to "bidders at the auction of popularity".

Sarvodaya is more of a socio-religious creed than a political one. It stands for the self-limitation of human wants. It distrusts the state and advocates the decentralisation of power and direct democracy. It stands for national unity and solidarity and condemns provincialism and religious fanaticism.

Sarvodaya is a powerful intellectual attempt to build a plan of political and social reconstruction on the basis of metaphysical idealism. It is a dynamic philosophy which can make possible the advent of a radically transformed humanity. It is not a complete philosophy but it gives an integrated thought structure. We may not agree with all the detailed techniques and formulas of Sarvodaya, but its vision is definitely majestic and

inspiring. Its great contribution lies in the assertion of a moral approach to the problems of men. It gives us a better and higher value of life. It gives us the message of love for all. It can help humanity to solve many of its problems.

Gandhiji and Karl Marx

It has rightly been pointed out that Karl Marx died when Gandhiji was just 11 years old and Gandhiji died 130 years after the birth of Marx. Marx, a German by birth, belongs to the whole world and is acclaimed as a prophet by the Communist world. Gandhiji, born in India, belongs to the whole of humanity. Both of them looked upon the cause of the down-trodden and exploited humanity as of utmost importance. Both of them were the mighty minds who moved men and led movements. Both fought against social suffering, economic exploitation and inequalities. It was not that they were both dreamers but both of them carved out a way to materialise their dreams. Both shed their tears on the suppression of the people, fought against the social injustices and tyrannies and gave a message of hope of emancipation from exploitation. Both of them have deeply influenced men and minds and have left behind a large following which is seeking to dogmatise and idolize their teaching and thoughts. It is a tragedy for both that they are more respected in foreign lands than in the lands of their birth. Both of them have influenced the course of the socialist movement in India and the socialist thinking in this country.

The objectives of Gandhiji and Marx are the same—to fight against injustice and exploitation of man and the setting up of a brave new world —but still they stand apart from each other. Their differences are basic and fundamental which cannot be bridged and reconciled, in the words of Vinoba Bhave, "The fact of the matter is that these ideologies are irreconcilable, the differences between them are fundamental.. It is as clear as day that they are opposed to each other."

Gandhiji was an ethical revolutionary. He emphasized the moral hollowness of modern civilization and suggested the sanctity of ethical substance and criterion. He believed in changing the heart of his opponent through the peaceful pursuit of persuasion and education. He believed that synthesis had more truth than the thesis and the anti-thesis. His whole life was a life of synthesis. His political philosophy was a synthesis of Indian Liberalism and Indian Extremism. He was a practical idealist. He secularised religion and spiritualised politics.

Marx drew his inspiration from the scientific rationalism of France and Germany and brought his theories before the court of reason and tried to have the verdict from it. By harnessing science and technology, through reason and human mind, he could rationalise our socio-economic process. He had faith in the powers of man, science and society. He formulated broad layers of history which were assumed to operate in the totality of the historical structure. His mission of materialism made him a realist and a man of action. He saw the social injustices, economic exploitation and political plunderings and he was in a hurry to cure those evils. He saw that capitalism had evils and therefore it must go. He had no patience to cure the evils of capitalism. The revolution which he sought to bring about was to result in the establishment of the dictatorship of the

proletariat and the transfer of the means of production from private hands to communal ownership. He believed in class-war and the liquidation of the bourgeoisie by violent means.

Both Gandhiji and Marx had a common destination to end exploitation and establish a free society, but the paths paved by them were different. Gandhiji, being born in India, had the impress of the heritage of his country. Marx became mature in the climate of capitalism and industrialism of the West. Both were the harbingers of hope to mankind. India achieved independence under the inspiring leadership of Gandhiji and Russia shook off the shackles of Czarism under the inspiration of Marxian ideology.

According to K. G. Mashruwala, "It has been often said that Gandhiji was a Communist minus violence. Indeed, it is possible to quote Gandhiji himself in support of this proposition. Gandhiji was not in the habit of rejecting descriptions of him or his principles, if they were meant as compliments, and if they helped his main mission. But in a careful examination of principles, such descriptions should not be regarded as very accurate and must not be used as handy definitions. The error of such descriptions lies in its capacity to conceal the full implications of the differential factor. When it is said that Gandhism is Communism minus violence, the impression created is that the 'minus violence' factor in Communism is some small impurity the removal of which will make it the same as Gandhism. As a matter of fact, even if it were possible to so equate Gandhism in terms of Communism, the 'minus violence' factor is a major factor of considerable value. The implications of 'minus violence' are so great as to make the equation as illusory as to say that red is green minus yellow and blue or a worm is a snake minus poison."

Gandhiji was not a systematic thinker. He was an inspired teacher and prophet who had no intention to work out a logical and theoretical construction. Like Socrates and Buddha, Gandhiji poured fourth the results of his deepest feelings and the most sincere realisations of truth. However, in all his writings one finds a unity of theme. On the other hand, Marx was trained in the traditions of German Hegelian metaphysics. He believed in the efficacy of logical reason and for over 30 years, he laboured and toiled persistently to give finishing touches to his system.

Gandhiji has influenced people through his pen and also by his sermons. He possessed an attractive personality of a prophet. He was shown the greatest reverence even by his opponents. Marx was engaged in a bitter and furious controversy with Proudhon, Bakunin, Lassalle, Bruno and Edgar. He possessed an aggressive personality. He was conscious of his towering intellectual strength which he complained was not recognised by others.

Gandhiji represented metaphysical idealism and Marx dialectical materialism. Gandhiji started with the conception of an omni-present fundamental spiritual reality which could be called Sachchidananda, Brahma, Rama or simply Truth. He inherited a strong faith in the existence of a deeper spiritual power, particularly from his mother. Gandhiji believed that the more disciplined he became, the more he approximated to the realisation of truth. He claimed to be true scientist in the sense that he constantly experimented that truth and tried to make his propositions

sounder by repeated observations. His faith in fundamental truth was not born out of arguments and observations but spiritual apprehension and intuition. On the other hand, Marx was a rationalist and he condemned mysticism and faith. He criticised idealistic philosophy. He fused the materialistic tradition of Democritus, Hobbes, Holbach and Feuerbach with the dialectics of German philosophy.

Gandhiji believed in ethical absolutism and Marx in ethical relativism. Gandhiji accepted idealism and believed in the superiority of ethical absolutism and philosophy of Sarvodaya. His own experiences in life convinced him of the superior efficacy of the moral norm. He considered truth and non-violence as absolutely binding. Marx on the other hand, accepted the relativism of the moral criterion. His view was that our ethical codes were the products of our social growth. There were no eternal moral principles and the ethical system was related to the relations of production.

Gandhiji and Marx differed on the question of religion as a factor in history. Gandhiji believed in truth and non-violence and accepted the force of religion in human history. He called himself a Hindu but he was no narrow sectarian. Like Buddha and Ramakrishna, he was above the bounds of creeds, cults, rituals and ceremonies. He accepted the essence of Hinduism which according to him was the essenece of all the great religions of mankind. According to him, religion signified an emphasis on the moral values of man. He provided the dynamic motion to his actions and life. Marx was an advocate of dialectic materialism and he considered religion to be reactionary force. According to him, religion was irrational. The ghosts and gods of different kinds were advocated by religion instead of scientific knowledge and light. Religion substituted the empty future consolation of an immortal destiny for the present subjection to misery, exploitation and oppression. At times, religion was hypocritical. Bishops and priests preached vague and fantastic gospels of eternity and the Kingdom of God because they were in the service of the temporal powers. Religion contained the remnants of antiquated conceptions of old. Religion was an ideology fitted to the production, organisation and relations of the time. With the dawn of the society of freedom, abundance and equality, man would not require the consolation of religion.

Gandhiji and Marx gave different solutions for mankind. The central evils against which Gandhiji fought were racialism, imperialism, communalism and untouchability. All problmes of labour versus capital were not important for him. While in South Africa, he fought against the racially discriminatory policies of the Government. In India, he fought against social injustices, tyrannies and oppressions. Primarily he was engaged in abolishing the unjust economic and political exploitation of India. Marx fought against the reactionary policies of the Prussian Government. For some time, he was engaged in the Revolution of 1848. He organised and led the First International and concentrated on bringing about proletarian solidarity. Gandhiji considered foreign imperialism as the enemy but Marx regarded bourgeois capitalism as the enemy. Gandhiji challenged the foundations of modern civilisation. He criticised the sophisticated, technological, secular, aggressive and lustful aspects of modern Western civilization. He considered it as equivalent to darkness and disease. He preached a return to nature like Plato, Rousseau and Tolstoy. He advocated simplicity in

everything. He stood for safeguarding the integrity and foundations of the villages because he believed that India lived in villages. His slogan was : "Back to the village." Gandhiji believed that a sound village economy would revitalize our democracy. In the Charkha, he found not the symbol of crudeness but the means and instrument of helping our people in getting the bare necessities of life.

Marxism grew on the creed of Western industrial world. The workers suffering under the injustices of the early years of industrial capitalism found in it a gospel of emancipation. Marx worked out a philosophy of history. The forces of production were the ultimate determining factors. History moves through struggles of different classes. It is moving towards the destruction of the present capitalist society. Capitalism has in itself contradictions which lead to its destruction. Marx considered capitalist economy as iniquitous as it was based on profit motive. He criticised capitalism not on moral grounds but on scientific grounds of reason. Capitalism would die because it has in itself certain contradictions. There is the contradiction between concentration and centralisation of capital at one pole and human misery on the other. There is the contradiction between simultaneous existence of over-production and economic crises. There is the contradiction between technological rationality operating in the factory and the chaotic structure of a polarized society. Marx was an advocate of the theory of surplus value. The labouring classes create more values but the surpluses are taken away by the exploiters. The division of labour converts man into an automation who has lost all aesthetic charm in his creative work. This division of labour should be replaced by a system which produces the multi-sided man. The capitalist practice of calculation in terms of monetary profit should be replaced by calculation in terms of labour. Marx exposed the vandalism of early colonialism and original capitalist accumulation. He described the terror and grimness of the havoc let loose on the masses by the capitalist system of industry. His denunciation of the evil practices of the existing capitalist system led to improvements in the working conditions of the labourers.

Both Gandhiji and Marx succeeded because they tried to find a solution to the eternal problem of man which is to provide him with bread. Marx called the capitalists as robbers. The view of Gandhiji was that anybody who had more than what he barely needed was a thief. Marx challenged theory and practice of capitalist accumulation. Gandhiji challenged accumulation in all its shapes.

Although both Gandhiji and Marx were opposed to the capitalistic processes of social and economic exploitation, their emphases were on different points. Gandhiji was a moral and spiritual individualist. The individual trying to better his character by moral ethics was the starting point of his ethics. The view of Marx was that not an appeal to the sentiment of justice by individual sacrifice but organised expropriation by the armed proletariat of the expropriators would destroy the evils of society. According to Gandhiji, the root of the disease was deeper. Not individual wealth but the individualistic propensity towards the acquisition of wealth was the central devil. Not the elimination of the actual amount of the quantities of commodities but the suppression of the drive towards accumulation and monopolistic possession of things alone could bring the desired change. Gandhiji was not opposed to institutional changes. He did

believe in the changes in the structure of society and politics. Like Buddha, he believe that the enemy was to be converted into a colleague and helper The really classless society based on mutual active love and harmony was his goal. The view of Marx was that the people who hold property now do not have any right to it. He did not say that property was theft but he did so that capitalistic extortion of the surplus was tinged with the blood of the proletariat. Any increase in the commodities constituting capital represented a corresponding extortion of the unpaid labour from the working class.

In a sense, both Gandhiji and Marx were anarchists. Gandhiji considered the state as an organisation of violence and force. His view was that in the ideal state of Ram Raj, there will be the sovereignty of the moral authority of the people and the state as a machine of violence will disappear. Gandhiji did not stand for the immediate ending of the power of the state. According to him, the immediate goal was to increase the perfection of the state but ultimately there was to be philosophical and moral anarchism. The view of Marx was that the capitalist state was to be replaced by the dictatorship of the proletariat which was to be the highest concentration of state power. It was to build foundations of the ultimate classless society.

The view of Marx was that the state was the child of social exploitation consequent on the growth of commodity production, the socialization of the means of production and the end of private appropriation. Ultimately, the state was to wither away. Marx did not advocate the deliberate destruction of state machinery but only its gradual withering away. In postulating the final ideal of anarchism, the spiritualist teachings of Gandhiji and the materialistic teachings of Marx joined hands.

Gandhiji was not a philosopher of history, but he accepted theological determinism. He literally believed that nothing could happen without the sanction of God. He believed that in the ultimate sense, God was the superior behind all things and movements in the world. However, his determinism never degenerated into fatalism. He was a strong advocate of action on the lines of the Gita. His whole life was full of ceaseless action. He combined a faith in the supremacy of God with his insistence on constant action. He never accepted the theory of absolute freedom for man. Freedom for him lay not in the assertion of the individual ego but in identification with the spiritual being. Freedom means realisation of the moral self. To Gandhiji, freedom was as a whole. Moral freedom from slavery to passions, national freedom from the bondage of alien rulers and exploiters and spiritual freedom from the demands of nature were all phases of freedom. Gandhiji was not prepared to compromise with evil, lust or slavery. He stood for simplicity. He was opposed to large scale industrialism and mechanisation. He was not a complete ruralist advocating complete return to village life. It is true that he condemned Western commercialism, imperialism and secularism as diseases, but later on he advocated a reconciliation of large-scale and small-scale industries, the nationalisation of key industries and the organisation of urban centres. He was not opposed even to rural electrification. Marx believed in the great power of reason to create a better society and happier future for man. To this extent, he was a product of the Renaissance spirit. He

believed that by harnessing the powers and capacities of mind, an increasing rationalisation of the socio-economic processes was possible. Nature was not to be worshipped as God but was to be conquered. Large-scale planning was to create conditions for increased production with less work. Marx was a child of the scientific bourgeois technological civilisation of the capitalistic West. He advocated not the limitation of needs and wants as Gandhiji did but the use of mechanised power for catering to the needs not of selfish groups but of the entire community. In Marx, the conception of freedom as rational knowledge and control of necessity is important. There is no place to appeal for control over human passions. His view was that with the increasing perfection of socialist society, human nature would undergo a transformation and there would emerge a new type of man who was devoid of religious superstitions and who would be interested in a programme of fraternity and comradeship. In Marx, the gospel of social actionism is strong. His belief in the powers of man, society and science is very great. Instead of his reference to man as the creator of history and transformer of nature, we find in his writings a belief in deterministic philosophy. His view was that history was working towards a resolution of the social drama in favour of the proletariat.

Gandhiji was a saint and a moral revolutionary. He put emphasis on moral bankruptcy of modern civilisation and advocated the sanctity of ethical substance. He believed that a peaceful solution to our problems was not only possible but was also the only way to have a real solution. Marx stood for a radical change in the social structure even if the same was to be brought about by force. Gandhiji was a realist with the occasional touch of a Prophet and a mystic. Marx was a dynamic fighter trying to revive the laws of Mosses. He was a living realist and a man of action. He never forgave the people who in any way sought to take advantage of him. His polemics against Proudhon, Bakunin and Lassalle are well-known. Gandhiji was an angelic saint who forgave even his opponents and even those who physically assaulted him. Marx saw deep but the visions of Gandhiji were deeper. Both of them were the shokesman of the aspirations of the suppressed humanity. Gandhiji brought about the greatest political transformation in Indian history. Marx created a legendary hope in the minds and hearts of the exploited all over the world.

Gandhiji took into consideration not only the ends but also the means. He insisted that noble ends and noble means must go together. The end did not justify the means. Nothing was politically right which was morally wrong. However, Marx did not care for the means provided those could achieve the end as quickly as possible.

Gandhiji put emphasis on non-violence but Marx put emphasis on violence. To Gandhiji, non-violence was not only the first article of his faith but also the last article of his creed. To quote him, "If India made violence her creed, I would not care to live in India. She would cease to evoke any pride in me." Gandhiji felt that "Violence like capitalism implied treating man as mere means. It degrades and brutalises those who use it and those against whom it is used, arousing in them hatred, fear and anger. Non-violence, on the other hand, exalts the Satyagrahi as well as the opponent, thus liberating social re-generation." However, Marx praised violence and maintained that the transition from capitalism to socialism would be brought about only by violence and bloodshed.

Gandhiji preached the philosophy of love but Marx preached the philosophy of hatred. Gandhiji adopted the precept of the Bible: "Love thy neighbour as thyself." He believed that every living being was a neighbour. To quote him, "I would not dispossess moneyed men by force but would invite their cooperation in the process of conversion to state ownership." Catlin writes about Gandhiji, "Against Marxism that preached class hatred of religion, race, class and colour, he preached another way by which the human race would advance further in the development of its power. Non-violence essentially means love, a capacity to feel for others. On the other hand, Communism regards the cult of hatred as being essential for propagating class war."

Gandhiji stood for democratic guidance but Marx stood for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Gandhiji was essentially a democrat and believed that democracy was essential for the well-being of the people. Marx had his faith in the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Gandhiji stood for decentralised democracy. His view was that real democracy was possible only in small republics where there were possibilities of direct contact between the Government and the governed. Marx stood for the dictatorship of the proletariat and did not believe in decentralised economy and administration. There was to be concentration in every sphere.

Marx held that philosophers had till then tried to explain the world but the need was to change it. His aims were the same as those of the French Revolution, to establish among men equality, liberty and brotherhood. Those aims are manifestly humanitarian in character. Marx searched for a method to bring about those changes in society. He felt that the method of change must be historical. He found that economics, more especially modes of production, were at the root of every change in all departments of life including the religious and the cultural. He held that this change would be accomplished through class-war between those who controlled the means of production and those who did not. The successive revolutions in history have brought about the capitalist order of society where those who have taken possession of the means of production dominate the world. This class of capitalists has to be liquidated and a classless society established through class-war and the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat. This dictatorship will subsequently establish democracy and then the state will wither away. There being no independent sovereign states, peace will be automatically established. The proletariat of one country will not fight against the proletariat of another country, their interests being identical.

Gandhiji did not minimize the value of economics in the life of the individual or the group. He held that the grinding poverty of the masses of India worked to their degradation and that must be removed. Unlike Marx, he did not think that all human values and institutions were the result of the working of economic forces. Gandhiji laboured to achieve the same humanitarian aims as those of Marx. However, he did not believe that dictatorship based on violence would automatically evolve itself into a democracy. With his belief in non-violence, Gandhiji would not advocate any form of Government except democracy. Like Marx, Gandhiji talked of the withering away of the state, but as a practical poli-

tician, he could not envisage a time when the state would disappear. He held that this would be possible only when most people were "a law unto themselves", so that they automatically did the right thing. As a practical proposition, Gandhiji held that that Government is the best which governs the least. For bringing about these revolutionary changes, Gandhiji tried to change the existing values which have so far gained currency among the peoples of the world, in the political and more especially in the international field. Gandhiji wanted the morality which guides man's individual and social conduct, to regulate their behaviour in the political field. He felt that to realise the humanitarian aims, the means employed must be in consonance with the end in view. The means must be as pure as the ends are high. Gandhiji conducted his campaign on the principle of truth and non-violence.

Ramswarup writes, "Gandhism and Communism do not represent arithmetical quantities, with more of the one quantity and less of the other. They represent two different tempers of mind, two ways of life, two incompatible world views and life veiws. The one is based on and founded in God; the other denies God. The difference is most fundamental. Other differences regarding centralisation of politics and production, violent or non-violent revolution are important so far as they go, but as compared to the former difference, they belong to the second order of smalls. Even the similarity in their humanism is more apparent than real. The humanism of the one leads to democracy, to tolerance, to faith, to hope; while the humanism of the other leads to violence, wholesale massacre, thought-control, purges, dictatorship, over-centralisation, secret police, forced confession and mutual spying. In short, though both the creeds stress man, the one tries to serve him by nourishing his charity, love, faith and patience, the other by nourishing his suspicion, his hatred, his fears, greed and possessive instincts."

Estimate

Different views have been expressed by different writers about Gandhiji. C. M. Joad has written that "Gandhi is one-third politician, one-third saint and one-third humbug." Gandhiji is also described as a "muddle-headed fool from whom we have nothing to learn."

Most of the critics criticise Gandhiji's views on non-violence. They point out that non-violence cannot solve the problems created by nuclear weapons. As a saint, Gandhiji wanted 50 per cent of the population to be killed at the time of attack and the rest left behind to non-cooperate with the invader. It is contended that this may lead to wholesale massacre of the people attacked. The Non-cooperation movement of the people may be crushed with a heavy hand. It is also contended that India did not get independence as a result of the non-violent policy of Gandhiji. There were many other forces which compelled the British Government to leave India and make her independent. An enemy can understand only the language of "tooth for tooth and eye for eye" and non-violent non-cooperation. The borders of a country and her integrity cannot be maintained through non-violence. Critics describe the trusteeship idea of Gandhiji as an eye-wash and a shelter for the rich. To quote Jayaprakash Narayan, "To a socialist, the philosophy amounts to deception—self-decep-

Gandhiji preached the philosophy of love but Marx preached the philosophy of hatred. Gandhiji adopted the precept of the Bible: "Love thy neighbour as thyself." He believed that every living being was a neighbour. To quote him, "I would not dispossess moneyed men by force but would invite their cooperation in the process of conversion to state ownership." Catlin writes about Gandhiji, "Against Marxism that preached class hatred of religion, race, class and colour, he preached another way by which the human race would advance further in the development of its power. Non-violence essentially means love, a capacity to feel for others. On the other hand, Communism regards the cult of hatred as being essential for propagating class war."

Gandhiji stood for democratic guidance but Marx stood for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Gandhiji was essentially a democrat and believed that democracy was essential for the well-being of the people. Marx had his faith in the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Gandhiji stood for decentralised democracy. His view was that real democracy was possible only in small republics where there were possibilities of direct contact between the Government and the governed. Marx stood for the dictatorship of the proletariat and did not believe in decentralised economy and administration. There was to be concentration in every sphere.

Marx held that philosophers had till then tried to explain the world but the need was to change it. His aims were the same as those of the French Revolution, to establish among men equality, liberty and brotherhood. Those aims are manifestly humanitarian in character. Marx searched for a method to bring about those changes in society. He felt that the method of change must be historical. He found that economics, more especially modes of production, were at the root of every change in all departments of life including the religious and the cultural. He held that this change would be accomplished through class-war between those who controlled the means of production and those who did not. The successive revolutions in history have brought about the capitalist order of society where those who have taken possession of the means of production dominate the world. This class of capitalists has to be liquidated and a classless society established through class-war and the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat. This dictatorship will subsequently establish democracy and then the state will wither away. There being no independent sovereign states, peace will be automatically established. The proletariat of one country will not fight against the proletariat of another country, their interests being identical.

Gandhiji did not minimize the value of economics in the life of the individual or the group. He held that the grinding poverty of the masses of India worked to their degradation and that must be removed. Unlike Marx, he did not think that all human values and institutions were the result of the working of economic forces. Gandhiji laboured to achieve the same humanitarian aims as those of Marx. However, he did not believe that dictatorship based on violence would automatically evolve itself into a democracy. With his belief in non-violence, Gandhiji would not advocate any form of Government except democracy. Like Marx, Gandhiji talked of the withering away of the state, but as a practical poli-

tician, he could not envisage a time when the state would disappear. He held that this would be possible only when most people were "a law unto themselves", so that they automatically did the right thing. As a practical proposition, Gandhiji held that that Government is the best which governs the least. For bringing about these revolutionary changes, Gandhiji tried to change the existing values which have so far gained currency among the peoples of the world, in the political and more especially in the international field. Gandhiji wanted the morality which guides man's individual and social conduct, to regulate their behaviour in the political field. He felt that to realise the humanitarian aims, the means employed must be in consonance with the end in view. The means must be as pure as the ends are high. Gandhiji conducted his campaign on the principle of truth and non-violence.

Ramswarup writes, "Gandhism and Communism do not represent arithmetical quantities, with more of the one quantity and less of the other. They represent two different tempers of mind, two ways of life, two incompatible world views and life veiws. The one is based on and founded in God; the other denies God. The difference is most fundamental. Other differences regarding centralisation of politics and production, violent or non-violent revolution are important so far as they go, but as compared to the former difference, they belong to the second order of smalls. Even the similarity in their humanism is more apparent than real. The humanism of the one leads to democracy, to tolerance, to faith, to hope; while the humanism of the other leads to violence, wholesale massacre, thought-control, purges, dictatorship, over-centralisation, secret police, forced confession and mutual spying. In short, though both the creeds stress man, the one tries to serve him by nourishing his charity, love, faith and patience, the other by nourishing his suspicion, his hatred, his fears, greed and possessive instincts."

Estimate

Different views have been expressed by different writers about Gandhiji. C. M. Joad has written that "Gandhi is one-third politician, one-third saint and one-third humbug." Gandhiji is also described as a "muddle-headed fool from whom we have nothing to learn."

Most of the critics criticise Gandhiji's views on non-violence. They point out that non-violence cannot solve the problems created by nuclear weapons. As a saint, Gandhiji wanted 50 per cent of the population to be killed at the time of attack and the rest left behind to non-cooperate with the invader. It is contended that this may lead to wholesale massacre of the people attacked. The Non-cooperation movement of the people may be crushed with a heavy hand. It is also contended that India did not get independence as a result of the non-violent policy of Gandhiji. There were many other forces which compelled the British Government to leave India and make her independent. An enemy can understand only the language of "tooth for tooth and eye for eye" and non-violent non-cooperation. The borders of a country and her integrity cannot be maintained through non-violence. Critics describe the trusteeship idea of Gandhiji as an eye-wash and a shelter for the rich. To quote Jayaprakash Narayan, "To a socialist, the philosophy amounts to deception—self-decep-

Gandhiji preached the philosophy of love but Marx preached the philosophy of hatred. Gandhiji adopted the precept of the Bible: "Love thy neighbour as thyself." He believed that every living being was a neighbour. To quote him, "I would not dispossess moneyed men by force but would invite their cooperation in the process of conversion to state ownership." Catlin writes about Gandhiji, "Against Marxism that preached class hatred of religion, race, class and colour, he preached another way by which the human race would advance further in the development of its power. Non-violence essentially means love, a capacity to feel for others. On the other hand, Communism regards the cult of hatred as being essential for propagating class war."

Gandhiji stood for democratic guidance but Marx stood for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Gandhiji was essentially a democrat and believed that democracy was essential for the well-being of the people. Marx had his faith in the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Gandhiji stood for decentralised democracy. His view was that real democracy was possible only in small republics where there were possibilities of direct contact between the Government and the governed. Marx stood for the dictatorship of the proletariat and did not believe in decentralised economy and administration. There was to be concentration in every sphere.

Marx held that philosophers had till then tried to explain the world but the need was to change it. His aims were the same as those of the French Revolution, to establish among men equality, liberty and brotherhood. Those aims are manifestly humanitarian in character. Marx searched for a method to bring about those changes in society. He felt that the method of change must be historical. He found that economics, more especially modes of production, were at the root of every change in all departments of life including the religious and the cultural. He held that this change would be accomplished through class-war between those who controlled the means of production and those who did not. The successive revolutions in history have brought about the capitalist order of society where those who have taken possession of the means of production dominate the world. This class of capitalists has to be liquidated and a classless society established through class-war and the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat. This dictatorship will subsequently establish democracy and then the state will wither away. There being no independent sovereign states, peace will be automatically established. The proletariat of one country will not fight against the proletariat of another country, their interests being identical.

Gandhiji did not minimize the value of economics in the life of the individual or the group. He held that the grinding poverty of the masses of India worked to their degradation and that must be removed. Unlike Marx, he did not think that all human values and institutions were the result of the working of economic forces. Gandhiji laboured to achieve the same humanitarian aims as those of Marx. However, he did not believe that dictatorship based on violence would automatically evolve itself into a democracy. With his belief in non-violence, Gandhiji would not advocate any form of Government except democracy. Like Marx, Gandhiji talked of the withering away of the state, but as a practical poli-

tician, he could not envisage a time when the state would disappear. He held that this would be possible only when most people were "a law unto themselves", so that they automatically did the right thing. As a practical proposition, Gandhiji held that that Government is the best which governs the least. For bringing about these revolutionary changes, Gandhiji tried to change the existing values which have so far gained currency among the peoples of the world, in the political and more especially in the international field. Gandhiji wanted the morality which guides man's individual and social conduct, to regulate their behaviour in the political field. He felt that to realise the humanitarian aims, the means employed must be in consonance with the end in view. The means must be as pure as the ends are high. Gandhiji conducted his campaign on the principle of truth and non-violence.

Ramswarup writes, "Gandhism and Communism do not represent arithmetical quantities, with more of the one quantity and less of the other. They represent two different tempers of mind, two ways of life, two incompatible world views and life veiws. The one is based on and founded in God; the other denies God. The difference is most fundamental. Other differences regarding centralisation of politics and production, violent or non-violent revolution are important so far as they go, but as compared to the former difference, they belong to the second order of smalls. Even the similarity in their humanism is more apparent than real. The humanism of the one leads to democracy, to tolerance, to faith, to hope; while the humanism of the other leads to violence, wholesale massacre, thought-control, purges, dictatorship, over-centralisation, secret police, forced confession and mutual spying. In short, though both the creeds stress man, the one tries to serve him by nourishing his charity, love, faith and patience, the other by nourishing his suspicion, his hatred, his fears, greed and possessive instincts."

Estimate

Different views have been expressed by different writers about Gandhiji. C. M. Joad has written that "Gandhi is one-third politician, one-third saint and one-third humbug." Gandhiji is also described as a "muddle-headed fool from whom we have nothing to learn."

Most of the critics criticise Gandhiji's views on non-violence. They point out that non-violence cannot solve the problems created by nuclear weapons. As a saint, Gandhiji wanted 50 per cent of the population to be killed at the time of attack and the rest left behind to non-cooperate with the invader. It is contended that this may lead to wholesale massacre of the people attacked. The Non-cooperation movement of the people may be crushed with a heavy hand. It is also contended that India did not get independence as a result of the non-violent policy of Gandhiji. There were many other forces which compelled the British Government to leave India and make her independent. An enemy can understand only the language of "tooth for tooth and eye for eye" and non-violent non-cooperation. The borders of a country and her integrity cannot be maintained through non-violence. Critics describe the trusteeship idea of Gandhiji as an eye-wash and a shelter for the rich. To quote Jayaprakash Narayan, "To a socialist, the philosophy amounts to deception—self-decep-

Gandhiji preached the philosophy of love but Marx preached the philosophy of hatred. Gandhiji adopted the precept of the Bible: "Love thy neighbour as thyself." He believed that every living being was a neighbour. To quote him, "I would not dispossess moneyed men by force but would invite their cooperation in the process of conversion to state ownership." Catlin writes about Gandhiji, "Against Marxism that preached class hatred of religion, race, class and colour, he preached another way by which the human race would advance further in the development of its power. Non-violence essentially means love, a capacity to feel for others. On the other hand, Communism regards the cult of hatred as being essential for propagating class war."

Gandhiji stood for democratic guidance but Marx stood for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Gandhiji was essentially a democrat and believed that democracy was essential for the well-being of the people. Marx had his faith in the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Gandhiji stood for decentralised democracy. His view was that real democracy was possible only in small republics where there were possibilities of direct contact between the Government and the governed. Marx stood for the dictatorship of the proletariat and did not believe in decentralised economy and administration. There was to be concentration in every sphere.

Marx held that philosophers had till then tried to explain the world but the need was to change it. His aims were the same as those of the French Revolution, to establish among men equality, liberty and brotherhood. Those aims are manifestly humanitarian in character. Marx searched for a method to bring about those changes in society. He felt that the method of change must be historical. He found that economics, more especially modes of production, were at the root of every change in all departments of life including the religious and the cultural. He held that this change would be accomplished through class-war between those who controlled the means of production and those who did not. The successive revolutions in history have brought about the capitalist order of society where those who have taken possession of the means of production dominate the world. This class of capitalists has to be liquidated and a classless society established through class-war and the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat. This dictatorship will subsequently establish democracy and then the state will wither away. There being no independent sovereign states, peace will be automatically established. The proletariat of one country will not fight against the proletariat of another country, their interests being identical.

Gandhiji did not minimize the value of economics in the life of the individual or the group. He held that the grinding poverty of the masses of India worked to their degradation and that must be removed. Unlike Marx, he did not think that all human values and institutions were the result of the working of economic forces. Gandhiji laboured to achieve the same humanitarian aims as those of Marx. However, he did not believe that dictatorship based on violence would automatically evolve itself into a democracy. With his belief in non-violence, Gandhiji would not advocate any form of Government except democracy. Like Marx, Gandhiji talked of the withering away of the state, but as a practical poli-

tician, he could not envisage a time when the state would disappear. He held that this would be possible only when most people were "a law unto themselves", so that they automatically did the right thing. As a practical proposition, Gandhiji held that that Government is the best which governs the least. For bringing about these revolutionary changes, Gandhiji tried to change the existing values which have so far gained currency among the peoples of the world, in the political and more especially in the international field. Gandhiji wanted the morality which guides man's individual and social conduct, to regulate their behaviour in the political field. He felt that to realise the humanitarian aims, the means employed must be in consonance with the end in view. The means must be as pure as the ends are high. Gandhiji conducted his campaign on the principle of truth and non-violence.

Ramswarup writes, "Gandhism and Communism do not represent arithmetical quantities, with more of the one quantity and less of the other. They represent two different tempers of mind, two ways of life, two incompatible world views and life veiws. The one is based on and founded in God; the other denies God. The difference is most fundamental. Other differences regarding centralisation of politics and production, violent or non-violent revolution are important so far as they go, but as compared to the former difference, they belong to the second order of smalls. Even the similarity in their humanism is more apparent than real. The humanism of the one leads to democracy, to tolerance, to faith, to hope; while the humanism of the other leads to violence, wholesale massacre, thought-control, purges, dictatorship, over-centralisation, secret police, forced confession and mutual spying. In short, though both the creeds stress man, the one tries to serve him by nourishing his charity, love, faith and patience, the other by nourishing his suspicion, his hatred, his fears, greed and possessive instincts."

Estimate

Different views have been expressed by different writers about Gandhiji. C. M. Joad has written that "Gandhi is one-third politician, one-third saint and one-third humbug." Gandhiji is also described as a "muddle-headed fool from whom we have nothing to learn."

Most of the critics criticise Gandhiji's views on non-violence. They point out that non-violence cannot solve the problems created by nuclear weapons. As a saint, Gandhiji wanted 50 per cent of the population to be killed at the time of attack and the rest left behind to non-cooperate with the invader. It is contended that this may lead to wholesale massacre of the people attacked. The Non-cooperation movement of the people may be crushed with a heavy hand. It is also contended that India did not get independence as a result of the non-violent policy of Gandhiji. There were many other forces which compelled the British Government to leave India and make her independent. An enemy can understand only the language of "tooth for tooth and eye for eye" and non-violent non-cooperation. The borders of a country and her integrity cannot be maintained through non-violence. Critics describe the trusteeship idea of Gandhiji as an eye-wash and a shelter for the rich. To quote Jayaprakash Narayan, "To a socialist, the philosophy amounts to deception—self-decep-

tion and deception of the exploited peoples." In fact, Gandhi never committed himself to any rigid socialist doctrine. His writings have a strongly socialist flavour. Alexander Horace calls Gandhiji a convinced socializer. Gandhiji's stress on Khadi is good so far as supplementing the income of the villagers is concerned but cottage industries are no substitute for modern industries. No country can face the world with her cottage industries. Gandhiji also later on realised the necessity of heavy industries. To quote him, "I am socialist enough to say that such factories should be nationalised or state controlled. They ought to be working under the most attractive and ideal conditions, not for profit, but for the benefit of humanity, love taking the place of greed as the motive. It is an alteration in the conditions of labour that I want. This mad rush for wealth must cease and the labour must be assured not only a living wage but a daily task that is not a mere drudgery."

It is contended that Gandhiji advocated internationalism at the cost of nationalism. However, this is not correct. He wanted India to help humanity but not at her own cost.

Boyd Orr writes about Gandhiji, "Is it possible that these great principles, these wonderful ideals could be applied on a world-wide scale? I think the time has come when they can be applied, they must be applied and they will be applied because people realised that there is no hope with modern science and the abnormal powers which the scientists have let loose for destruction. If science be applied to violence, to a global war, it will lead to the destruction of civilisation."

Dr. Moin Shakir writes that the personal life of Gandhiji was an experiment with truth. In the process of experiment, he had to revise his attitudes and surrender his pre-conceptions as truth demanded. His contradictions and inconsistencies form a part of the dialectics of the Truth process. While from the point of view of political strategy and realism, Gandhi may be considered to have followed the example of Tilak in politicizing the masses, he was essentially the follower of Gokhale in his concern for truth and ethical standards in all spheres of life. (Politics and Society, p. 177).

Gandhiji was a saintly man who devoted the whole of his life for helping suffering humanity. He was a worshipper of truth and he did not deviate from his idealism. He created a mass base for the Indian national movement. He gave a life-tonic to the semi-paralysed people. He gave "a message that has enabled the humble to raise their heads and recognise their place in the Sun."

The ultimate inspiration for the idealism of Gandhiji came from the great importance he attached to human values. Humanism is the key-point and the enduring element of his philosophy. Gandhiji inherited and enriched the humanist tradition. He often used to say that the supreme consideration for him was man. To quote Gandhiji, "My life is one indivisible whole and all my activities run into one another and they have all their rise in my insatiable love for mankind." In his political philosophy, man occupies the same place as the Sun in the solar system. Gandhiji wanted to realise God through service of humanity. He was of the earth and he wanted the Kingdom of God to be established not in

heaven but on this earth. He had no charm for life beyond. He was not other-worldly. In the words of Dr. K. M. Munshi, "Gandhi killed other-worldliness which was India's obsession". The view of Prof. George Catlin is that Gandhiji's "escape was not from reality but into it." Gandhiji based his philosophy on action and not upon contemplation.

Gandhiji was not merely a moral reformer. He believed in the goodness of human nature. He believed in converting an individual howsoever depraved he may be. If moral persuasion failed to bring about the desired effect, Gandhiji would not retire from the field. He advocated in that case non-violent non-cooperation and civil disobedience. To quote him, "It is not a question of changing this man's heart or that man's heart, we have to do or play our part rightly and in the hope that others will act in the right manner." He advocated confiscation of the vested interests where necessary and take-over by the state of the possessions of the rich with the minimum use of violence. He was essentially a figher in the cause of truth. He evolved a technique of Satyagraha to achieve his mission in life. If he had been merely a spiritual savant or an ordinary moral reformer, he would not have cared for the external and organisational arrangements and would have thought in terms of retirement. He had the urge in him to rehabilitate man spiritually, morally and in his social relationship.

The basis of the political thought of Gandhiji is rooted in his concern for humanity. His passion for service flowed out of his great love for man. His was a philosophy of love. In the words of Acharya Kripalani, "Love for him was a collective and individual tie—love of the poor, love of humanity." Gandhiji's humanism was not mere sentimentalism but manliness and defiance of evil. Like Buddha and Christ, he preached love and practised love to conquer hatred. He bore intense hatred too. It was hatred of a new quality, hatred without spitefulness. He placed man above the system and bore no hatred for the man personally who appeared as the perpetrator of violence and exploitation. His goal was to "combine the greatest love with the greatest opposition to wrong." He hated monopoly and concentration of economic and political power in the hands of a few. He hated exploitation of man by man and cowardly submission to the same. His burning passion inspired him to offer organised resistance to what was morally degrading. His was not a philosophy of non-resistance as preached and practised by the Christian Pacifists. He was opposed to all relations, all conditions in which man is humiliated, enslaved and despised. That is why Gandhism is humanism.

Humanism places man above all things. Man is considered to be a creative agency, a moral and intellectual being and not an automation. Man is not an abstract concept. Man is a concrete, living being, living in association with other individuals. Louis Fischer writes that Gandhiji's loyalty "was not a loyalty to abstractions; it was a loyalty to living human beings." Gandhiji's concept of man was not an abstract one as was the case of many philosophical idealists and mechanical materialists. He was essentially a practical man and he viewed man as a concrete being though not in his historical setting. His appeal to individual conscience and his emphasis on individual regeneration and his pronouncements on the dignity and moral authority of the individual have led many writers to call him

an individualist. However, his individualism was different from the individualist philosophy that what is best for the individual is automatically best for the social good. Gandhiji's concern for individual freedom does not seek the elevation of the individual ego. His individual is a social individual, but not in the Marxian sense. He did not subordinate the individual to an abstraction like the state or the society. His individual was not to be sacrificed at the altar of anonymous industrial complex or impersonal state machine. There is an eternal note of humanism. Gandhiji insisted on the ultimate authority of the individual. Whatever view may be taken of his concern for the individual, he was faithful to the dignity of human personality. He was opposed to anything that would undermine that dignity in the slightest degree or thwart in any manner the right of every human-being to live and to "be".

This elemental humanism is the positive content of Gandhiji's political and social thought which shall endure for ever. On account of his seminal humanism, he retained his faith in man. He is said to have written thus at a time of a great crisis in Indian history, "You must not lose faith in humanity."

Gandhiji combined in himself a keen sense of realism and the essence of true idealism. He did his level best to move this world from imperfection to perfection. His thirst for perfection has led many writers to call him a utopian visionary but he was not so. He never ignored the concrete and the real. Aldous Huxley called Gandhiji "a dreamer" who "had his feet firmly planted on the ground." Gandhiji was hundred percent a practical man. However, he dreamt in terms of transcending the present. He dreamt of a new world where poverty and exploitation will not exist and where non-violence would govern human life. He dreamt of a society where the individual will be free from all fetters which put restraints on his personality. In the words of Asoka Mehta, in Gandhiji "Utopianism is epitomised at his highest and the best." The socialists of today can learn from his deep humanism, his undoubted love for humanity, his readiness to suffer and make the supreme sacrifice for the liberation of the people. He gave a message of fearlessness and courage which will inspire mankind for ever. We all can copy his technique of dealing with large members of human-beings, his method of evoking self-confidence and a creative response in them, building up their initiatives step by step and then hurling them into action in a disciplined manner at the crucial moment. We can learn from his humanism and mass approach which made him the leader of suffering humanity. He belonged to mankind. He will live as long as humanity lives. His was a voice of eternal revolt against oppression and injustice.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Agarwala, A.N. : *Gandhism, A Scientific Approach.*
Agarwal, S.N. : *Sarvodaya : Its Principles and Programme*, 1951.
Ambedkar, B.R. : *Gandhi and Gandhism*, Jullunder, 1970.
Andrews, C.F. : *Mahatma Gandhi's Ideas*, 1930.
Bandyopadhyaya, J. : *Social and Palitical Thought of Gandhi*, Bombay, 1969.
Bari, S.A. : *Gandhi's Doctrine of Civil Resistance*, New Delhi, 1971.
Basu, N.K. : *Studies in Gandhism*, 1940.

Bhattacharya, Buddhadeva : *Evolution of the Political Philosophy of Gandhi*, Calcutta, 1969.

Bihari, Bipin : *Gandhian Economic Philosophy*, Bombay, 1963.

Bilpodiwala, N. : *The Social Order and Sarvodaya*, Varanasi, 1965.

Biswas, S.C. (Ed.) : *Gandhi—Theory and Practice ; Social Impact and Contemporary Relevance*, Simla, 1969.

Bondurant, Joan V. : *Conquest of Violence, The Gandhian Philosophy of Conflicts*, Oxford University Press, 1958.

Buch, M.S. : *Rise and Growth of Indian Nationalism, Non-violent Nationalism, Gandhi and His School.*

Catlin, G.E. : *In the Path of Mahatma Gandhi*, 1950.

Datta, D.M. : *The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*, Calcutta, 1968.

Devanesan, C.D.S. : *The Making of the Mahatma*, Orient Longmans, New Delhi, 1969.

Dhawan, G.N. : *The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*, 1946.

Diwakar, R.R. : *Satyagraha : Its Technique and History*, 1946.

Diwakar, R.R. : *Gandhi—A Practical Philosopher*, Bombay, 1964.

Doctor, A.H. : *Sarvodaya*, Calcutta, 1962.

Fischer, Louis : *Gandhi and Stalin*, Delhi, 1947.

Gadre, Kamala : *The Coming Struggle for Trusteeship*, New Delhi, 1971.

Gandhi, M.K. : *Non-violence in Peace and War*, 1942.

Ganguli, B.N. : *Gandhi's Social Philosophy*, Delhi, 1973.

Gupta, Nagendra Nath : *Gandhi and Gandhism*, 1945.

Gupta, S.S. : *The Economic Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*, Delhi.

Gregg, B.R. : *The Power of Non-Violence*, 1938.

Horace, Alexander : *Social and Political Ideas of Mahatma Gandhi.*

Horace, Alexander : *Gandhi Through Western Eyes*, 1969.

Iyer, Raghvan : *The Moral and Political Thought of Mahatma Gandhi.*

Kamal, K.K. and Mathur, P.C. : *Gandhi and Social Change*, University of Rajasthan, Jaipur.

Karunakaran, K.P. : *New Perspectives on Gandhi*, Simla, 1969.

Keer, Dhananjay : *Mahatma Gandhi—Political Saint and Unarmed Prophet*, 1973.

Kriplani, J.B. : *The Gandhian Way*, 1938.

Kriplani, J.B. : *Gandhi, His Life and Thought*, Government of India, New Delhi, 1970.

Kumarappa, J.C. : *Gandhian Economic Thought*, Varanasi, 1962.

Lohia, Rammanohar : *Marx, Gandhi and Socialism*, Hyderabad, 1963.

Mashruwala, K.G. : *Gandhi and Marx*, 1954.

Mashruwala, K.G. : *Practical Non-Violence*, 1945.

Mathur, J.S. (Ed.) : *Gandhian Thought and Contemporary Society.*

Majumdar, B.B. : *The Gandhian Concept of the State.*

Menon, V.L. : *Ruskin and Gandhi*, Varanasi, 1965.

Munshi, M.K. : *Reconstruction of Society Through Trusteeship*, Bombay.

Nag, Kalidas : *Tolstoy and Gandhi*, Patna, 1950.

Namboodiripad, E.M.S. : *The Mahatma and the Ism*, 1958.

Narayan, Shriman : *Gandhi —The Man and His Thought*, Publications Division, Government of India, 1969.

Orr, Lord Boyd : *Gandhian Outlook and Techniques.*

Payer, Robut : *The Life and Death of Mahatma Gandhi.*

Power, Paul F. : *The Meaning of Gandhi.*

Prabhu, R.K. and Rao, U.R. : *The Mind of Mahatma Gandhi*, 1945.

Pradhan, Benudhar : *The Socialist Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*, Vol. II, Delhi, 1980.

Prasad, Mahadeo : *Social Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi*, Gorakhpur, 1958.

Pyarelal : *Gandhian Techniques in the Modern World*, Ahmadabad, 1959.

Rajagopalachari, C. : *Gandhiji's Teachings and Philosophy*, Bombay, 1967.

Rajendra Prasad : *Legacy of Gandhi*, Agra, 1962.

Ram Rattan : *Gandhi's Concept of Political Obligation*.

Rao, S.K. Ramchandra : *The Idea of Sarvodaya*, Bangalore, 1957.

Ray, J.K. : *Studies in Political Thought*.

Ray, Shibnarayan : *Gandhi, India and the World*.

Saiyidain, K.G. : *Significance of Gandhi as a Man and Thinker*, 1970.

Santhanam, K. : *Satyagraha and State*, Bombay, 1962.

Sarkar, Dandana (Ed.) : *Towards Trusteeship*, Tamilnad Sarvodaya Sangh, Coimbatore, 1974.

Sharma, B.S. : *Gandhi as a Political Thinker*, Allahabad, 1956.

Sitaramayya, B.P. : *Gandhi and Gandhism*, 1942.

Sitaramayya, B.P. : *Socialism and Gandhism*, 1938.

Spratt, P. : *Gandhism, An Analysis*, 1939.

Swarup, Ram : *Gandhism and Communism*, New Delhi, 1955.

Tandon, V. : *The Social and Political Philosophy of Sarvodaya After Gandhi*, Varanasi, 1965.

Verma, S. : *Metaphysical Foundation of Mahatma Gandhi's Thought*, Orient Longmans, 1970.

Varma, V.P. : *The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi and Sarvodaya*, Agra, 1965.

Wellock, Wilfred : *Gandhi as a Social Revolutionary*, 1953.

CHAPTER XXII

Jawaharlal Nehru (1889-1964)

In the words of Sir S. Radhakrishnan, former President of India, "Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the greatest figures of our generation, an outstanding statesman whose services to the cause of human freedom are unforgettable. As a fighter for freedom, he was illustrious; as a maker of modern India, his services were unparalleled." Einstein said of Nehru, "He combines Tagore's love for beauty and Gandhiji's spiritualism, with a dynamic scientific mind of his own." Michael Brecher writes that Nehru was a giant both as man and a statesman. If political greatness can be measured by the capacity to direct events, to rise above the crest of the waves, to guide his people and to serve as a catalyst of progress, then Nehru surely qualifies for greatness.

Nehru was a man of indomitable will who knew no fear of any kind. He was a man of colossal energy. It was under his Presidentship that the Indian National Congress passed the Independence Resolution on the banks of the river Ravi at Lahore on 31 December 1929. It was under his leadership that Independence Oath was taken for the first time on 26 January 1930. He moved the "Quit India" Resolution in August 1942. He formed the Interim Government in August 1946. On 15 August 1947, he took over as first Prime Minister of India and remained in that post for about 17 years without any break. He tried to put India on a progressive, scientific, dynamic and non-communal foundation. He was a great nation-builder. He was the founder of our secularism. He was our greatest parliamentarian who showed great respect for Parliament. He was the architect of India's foreign policy. He was not a dictator and did not aspire to be one, but no dictator had enjoyed as much power as he did.

Nehru set India firmly on the road to modernity. He was a distinguished writer, thinker, dreamer and statesman. He made socialism a philosophy of the national movement. He was perhaps the first leader who perceived the Indian national movement as a part and parcel of the world freedom movement. He provided an international perspective to contemporary thinking. Most of his predecessors and co-workers were religious and obscurantist, but Nehru courageously fought the battle against dogmatism, bigotry and political manifestations of religion. He laid down the foundation of socialist and democratic theory and state in India. He knew his own limitations. He admitted, "My politics had been those of my class, the bourgeoisie". He was an admirer of the Western model of democracy, Communism, planning and orthodox Liberalism. He was a mixture of the East and the West. In his speeches and writings, he echoed the ideas of Voltaire and Thomas Paine. He had admiration for dynamism.

Jawaharlal Nehru was born on 14 November 1889 at Allahabad and he died on 27 May 1964 at New Delhi. He was the eldest and the only son of

an artistocratic, prosperous and Westernised Kashmiri Brahman lawyer, Motilal Nehru who was the leading-most lawyer of the High Court of Allahabad. The young Nehru admired his father for his mental strength, courage, pride and liberal and progressive social ideas. He acquired from his father a sense of national pride.

At the age of 15, young Nehru went to England for studies. He studied at Harrow and then in the Trinity College, Cambridge. He came back to India in 1912. He joined the Allahabad High Court as a barrister but found no interest in his work as a lawyer. He joined the Indian National Congress but felt dissatisfied with the Moderates. He was attracted by the Servants of India Society started by Gokhale. Although he did not join it, yet he had great admiration for the "straight and single-minded and continuous work" which its members were doing. In 1916, he met Gandhiji. He joined the Home Rule Leagues of Tilak and Annie Besant. The Jallianwala Bagh tragedy of April 1919 was a turning point in his career. He was attracted by the Satyagraha Sabha started by Gandhiji to defy the Rowlatt Act and other repressive measures of the British Government. In the summer of 1920, he came into contact with the peasant movement in Oudh. He felt the pinch of poverty and oppression and became conscious of the agrarian troubles of peasant India. The Non-cooperation movement of Gandhiji brought him and Nehru close to each other. "We felt that we knew him quite well enough to realise that he was a great and unique man and a glorious leader, and having put our faith in him, we gave him an almost blank cheque for the time being at least." What drew Nehru to Gandhiji was the Non-cooperation movement which "offered me what I wanted—the goal of national freedom and the ending of the exploitation of the underdog and the means which satisfied my moral sense and gave me a sense of personal satisfaction." The withdrawal of the Non-cooperation movement on a very trivial affair was a rude shock to Nehru. He could not restrain himself and observed, "But even if it was a serious matter, was a national movement involving scores of thousands directly and millions indirectly to be thrown out of gear because an individual had erred. This seemed to me a monstrous proposition, an immoral one."

Nehru had been arrested in December 1921 but he was released after some time. He was again arrested and kept in jail up to January 1923. In 1923, he was elected as the Chairman of the Allahabad Municipal Board for three years, but he resigned after two years. He went to Europe in March 1926. In February 1927, he attended the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities at Brussels as a representative of the Indian National Congress. In November 1927, he paid a brief visit to Russia and was very much impressed by what he saw there. He admired the Communists for their ideals but did not like their dictatorial ways and violent methods.

He came back to India in December 1927. In December 1928, he participated in the All-India Trade Union Congress held at Jharia and was elected its President. He was elected President of the Indian National Congress in December 1929 at the age of 40. His speech as the President of the Indian National Congress was a masterly performance. He was arrested in April 1930 in the Civil Disobedience movement but released in January 1931. He took part in the Karachi session of the Congress held in March 1931 and drafted a resolution on Fundamental Rights and Economic Policies with the approval of Gandhiji. He presided over the Lucknow session of

the Congress held in April 1936. In 1937, he was re-elected President of the Congress for the third time. To refresh his mind and regain his lost spirit, Nehru went to Europe in June 1938 and visited Spain, England and Czechoslovakia. He condemned Britain and France for the murder of the Spanish Republic and betrayal of Czechoslovakia. He was on a brief visit to China in August 1939. He was arrested on 31 October 1940 and sentenced to four years' rigorous imprisonment. During his trial, he made a statement in which he declared, "Though I am standing before you on my trial, it is the British Empire itself that is on its trial before the bar of the world." In January 1942, Gandhiji publicly declared Jawaharlal Nehru as his successor. When Cripps came to India in March 1942, Nehru was keen to have a settlement but Gandhiji opposed the Cripps Proposals and the mission failed. Nehru tried to prevent Gandhiji from taking any hasty step but he failed. The result was the Quit India resolution on 8 August 1942. He was arrested on 9 August 1942 and he remained in jail till the end of the World War II in 1945. He was elected President of the Congress in 1946 and he was invited to form the Interim Government in September 1946. He became the Prime Minister of India when India became free and independent on 15 August 1947. As Prime Minister, he worked day and night for the progress and prosperity of the country. Under his leadership, India came to have a voice in the politics of the world but he died on 27 May 1964.

Sources

The political thought of Nehru can be found in his "Glimpses of World History", his Autobiography, Discovery of India, a large number of his essays and writings of a fundamental character and his numerous speeches and addresses.

Nehru was a revolutionary, internationalist, a democrat, a socialist, a pacifist, an individualist etc. He was a free thinker and was always ready to change his view or action according to his thinking. He had certain basic convictions and ideology. He adhered to certain values throughout his life. He was anti-Fascist and disliked totalitarianism. He believed in human values, in the dignity of the individual and civil liberty. He believed in democracy but not of the capitalist type.

Individualism

The whole of the philosophy of Nehru revolved around the individual. He attached great importance to the all-round development of the individual in society. In June 1956, he told Michael Brecher, "I do believe that ultimately it is the individual that counts. No individual is trivial. Every individual has an importance and he should be given full opportunities to develop". Nehru believed that the good of the individual could best be realised in a democracy. Democracy was a means to an end which was the good life of the individuals. The Government was the instrument for the development of the individuality of man. Nehru was not prepared to sacrifice the individual at the altar of the state or society. He had a natural inclination towards the individual in comparison to society. He firmly believed that "real progress will come only when opportunity is given to the individual to develop, provided the individual is not a selected group but combines the whole community".

According to Nehru, the good of an individual belonging to a privileged class would not lead to social good. Individuals were supposed to develop themselves in a manner which would help the larger interests of the whole community. In order to save the individual from the crowd, a democratic society should "provide the individual with the conditions of creative development".

In the case of a conflict between the state and individual, the sympathy of Nehru was with the individual. He found that the centralisation of authority and power resulted in encroachments on the freedom of the individual. To some extent that was inevitable on account of the complications of modern life. However, sometimes the process of centralisation was carried to such an extreme that individual freedom almost vanished.

Nehru did not believe in the sacrifice of the spirit of individual freedom at the altar of the state. He refers to the long struggle of man against adverse surroundings in the face of innumerable difficulties. He felt that in spite of many failures on the part of man, his achievements and successes in this field were remarkable. Freedom was not merely political but also economic and spiritual. Only then could man grow and fulfil his destiny. Freedom had also to be seen not merely in terms of group freedom but also individual freedom within free national groups in the larger context of world freedom and order. In spite of conflicts in modern life, Nehru had no doubt that the spirit of man will triumph again.

Nehru believed in various freedoms of man inside the state. For the better functioning of those freedoms, he would rather allow a minor wrong to happen than to suppress it. The reason given was that if one attempted to "suppress the wrong type of thing, a right type of thing may also be suppressed along with it and it is bad to suppress the right thing."

The view of Nehru was that the freedom of the individual must not affect society adversely. There could not be absolute freedom for the individual to act as he liked in any social group. The idea of individual freedom arose in the days of autocracy in every country where an autocratic ruler suppressed individual freedom.

During the struggle for freedom in India, Nehru put great emphasis on civil liberty and the right of free expression of opinion, free association and combination, a free press and freedom of conscience and religion. For him, civil liberty was not a pious wish. It was something which was essential for the orderly development and progress of the naion. A contrary opinion could not be crushed forcibly because some people disliked it. Nehru compared it to the cracking of the skull of an opponent because they did not approve of him. The reason given was that the man with the cracked skull might collapse and die but the suppressed opinion or idea had no such sudden end and it survived and prospered the more it was sought to be crushed with force. History was full of such examples.

Nehru writes in his Autobiography that nobody could say that he would always and without fail act legally. Even in a democratic state, occasions may arise when one's conscience compels one to act otherwise. Under a despotic Government, such occasions were bound to arise more frequently. In a free democratic state, statesmen would stand behind the law in order to preserve the state itself.

Nehru's faith in individual freedom and civil liberty was fundamental. When he spoke of them, he did so in the context of a civilised orderly state. He was prepared to believe that there might be no law and order till freedom was achieved by the people, but after that, order becomes the foundation of society. Nehru approved of the view that "liberty is not the daughter but the mother of order."

As the individual had to be protected in the state, in the same way the social organism had to be protected against the predatory individuals. It is true that the individual was uppermost in the mind of Nehru but an individual could not be separated from other individuals in a social organism. "The rights of the individual must be balanced by the obligations of the individual to the social organism. Without obligations, there can be no real rights."

In actual administration, Nehru was a stern believer in discipline and order. He advocated firm action against those individuals who were indisciplined. To him, the use of violent methods on democratic issues was very dangerous. He did not want the Government to take any risk.

The view of Nehru was that unless the state was perfect and every individual was perfect, there was always the possibility of a conflict between the freedom of an individual and the needs of the security of the state. In the case of such a conflict, a line had to be drawn and that depends on the circumstances of each case. To quote Nehru, "In war, it goes far towards the state, in peace time it should go far towards the individual, the state always being there—you cannot ignore the state or endanger the state."

As the Head of the Government after Independence of India in 1947, Nehru wanted to protect the state against disorderly and violent activities. In certain cases, firings took place or some people were shot down or killed or wounded. In such circumstances, while he sympathised with the victims, he justified the action of the state. Nehru stood for the growth of the individual and the safety of the state. Freedom of the individual was as necessary as the freedom of the state for such growth.

Nehru was against Fascism and Communism as both of them were based on totalitarian concepts. Between Fascism and Communism, Nehru was prepared to accept the latter. However, Nehru revolted against the suppression of human values under a Communist regime. While Nehru praised the Communist emphasis on social justice, he criticised it for its rigidity and absence of freedom of expression.

Equality

In his Presidential address to the Indian National Congress at Lahore in 1929 Nehru declared, "Today politics have ceased to have much meaning and the most vital question is that of social and economic equality". He put emphasis on the importance of equality in 1933 in these words : "Democracy means equality and democracy can only flourish in an equal society." Equality does not mean "equality of possessing a vote but also economic and social equality." By equality, Nehru did not mean equalising all persons and groups. "What is essential is that they should be given equal opportunities to develop. If a nation, or a group, or an individual has the capacity in him to develop, he should have that oppor-

tunity." Democracy is a great leveller but even then people differ educationally, economically etc. All human beings are not equal in the matter of ability or capacity. It depends upon individual human beings as to the extent to which they could develop their faculties, but there must be "a society in which there is equality of opportunity and the possibility of every one to lead a good life.....A social structure which denies him this opportunity stands self-condemned and must be changed."

According to Nehru, equality includes all aspects of life, whether political, social, economic or cultural. Life is a complete whole and society must try to remove disparities in all spheres. The ideal of Nehru was "social equality in the widest sense and equality of opportunity for every one." Nehru believed in social equality of man without any distinciton of caste, race, colour or social status. Every one was to consider the other as his brother, not higher or lower. None was to be worshipped or despised, but treated as equal with equal rights to share. Nehru stood for the removal of special privileges. Political and social freedom and equality must lead to economic freedom and equality. "There is no such thing as freedom for a man who is starving or for a country which is poor." Democracy cannot last long without a just economic structure. Freedom and poverty are incompatible. To quote Nehru, "Freedom becomes unimportant where there is absolute poverty prevailing. If through poverty for other reasons you do not have even the capacity to live worthily, all other freedoms do not count." The ultimate aim of a democratic society is "to put an end to the differences between the rich and the poor, between the people who have opportunities and those who have very few or none." Nehru's conclusion was: "True freedom is not merely political but must also be economic and spiritual. Only then can man grow and fulfil his destiny."

Nehru realised the possibility of a conflict between political freedom and economic freedom on practical considerations. Even from a theoretical point of view, he accepted the difficulty of harmonising the two concepts. According to him, "Freedom carried to the extreme is anarchy" and "liberty and democracy have no meaning without equality." Nehru doubted if ultimately the concept of equality could be coordinated with freedom "because when you bring equality, it may interfere with somebody's freedom." The conflict can be resolved to some extent by striking a balance between the two.

The question is which of the two—freedom or equality—is more fundamental and basic. Nehru was impressed by both—liberal democratic ideas emphasizing freedom and socialistic ideas emphasizing equality. The view of Nehru was that freedom was the dominating idea of the nineteenth century but the twentieth century demanded equality also. Nehru was not able to provide an answer as to which of the two was more fundamental or basic but he believed that "political freedom or political equality is the very basis on which you build up other equalities. At the same time, political equality may cease to have meaning if there is gross economic inequality. But political equality is the basis of other equalities."

Democracy

Nehru did not advocate a new concept of democracy. His view of democracy was an amalgam of ideas of Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Ben-

tham, J. S. Mill and Karl Marx. Nehru declared in 1935, "My roots are still perhaps partly in the nineteenth century and I have been too much influenced by the humanist liberal tradition to get out of it completely." Nehru had faith in the dignity of the individual. Faith in the people is the essence of his concept of democracy. To quote him, "One has to take the vast masses of the people into confidence. One has to produce a sensation in them that they are partners in the vast undertaking of running a nation, partners in Government, partners in industry. That is the essence of democracy."

According to Nehru, "Democracy is not only political, not only economic but something of the mind. It involves equality of opportunity to all as far as possible in the political and economic domain. It involves the freedom of the individual to grow and make the best of his capacities and ability. It involves a certain tolerance of others and even of others' opinions when they differ from your's. It is dynamic not a static thing. It is a mental approach, applied to our political and economic problems."

Definition of Democracy

D.E. Smith has analysed the definitions of democracy as given by Nehru from time to time as democracy defined in terms of the freedom in which human values can be realised, democracy defined in terms of certain governmental institutions and procedures, democracy defined in terms of a structure of society in which economic and social equality can gradually be acquired and democracy defined in terms of a certain attitude and approach to problems on the part of the individual and society.

(a) As an individualist, Nehru attached great importance to the fate of the individual in a democracy. In a truly democratic state, there is freedom for the realisation of human values and the creative development of the individual. Nehru was against the brutalization of individuals. To quote him, "More and more the individual is giving way to the crowd. The crowd seldom places the reins on itself that the individual often feels compelled to do. The crowd dominates the individual but lacks a conscience of its own. Almost everywhere today individual is giving himself to the crowd or is being seized by it. The crowd is brute. The crowd terrifies me." The view of Nehru was that wars and violence were responsible for the vulgarization of the individual.

The view of Nehru was that a democratic state alone provided a structure of society in which human values can be realised. Nehru moved the Objectives Resolution in the Constituent Assembly in which he put emphasis on guaranteeing and securing to all the people of India freedom of thought, expression, belief, faith, worship, vocation, association and action.

Nehru did not advocate unrestricted freedom. To quote him, "In a democratic society, concept of individual freedom has to be balanced with social freedom and the relation of the individual with the social group. The individual must not infringe on the freedom of other individuals." Again, "It seemed to me obvious that in a complex social structure, individual freedom had to be limited and perhaps the only way to real freedom was through some such limitation in the social sphere." Freedom and democracy have to be limited lest they injure others.

Nehru advocated the use of coercion for safeguarding freedom. He stood for striking a balance between the security of the state and freedom of the individual. Society can also seek protection against selfish individuals. It is difficult to draw a clear-cut line of demarcation between the security of the state and liberty of the individual, but "in times of war the demarcation should be in favour of the state and in peace it should be to the advantage of the individual."

Nehru saw the danger to individual freedom from cenrtalisation in modern times. There is a concentration of authority not only in the British Cabinet but also in a handful of experts as Parliament finds it impossible to deal with complex and technical questions. The whole democratic structure of Government is imperilled by this development. Although individual freedom is attacked from different directions, it is a part of a modern democratic state. Democracy will cease to exist if individual is not assured freedom for the realisation of human values.

(b) Nehru also defined democracy in terms of representative institutions. That means popular sovereignty through elected representatives, majority rule and responsible political parties and leaders. Nehru wanted the people of India to decide the Constitution of India. To Nehru, political equality, i.e., gradual widening of the right of franchise so as to allow right to vote to everybody, without any discrimination on the basis of wealth, was an essential ingredient of democracy. To quote him, "Political power which the vote was supposed to give was seen to be a shadow with no substance, without economic power and the brave dreams of the early democrats that equality would follow from the vote, came to nothing."

According to Nehru, majority rule is an integral part of democracy. To quote him, "If a Government is in line with the thought of the majority of the people, it is a democratic Government." However, the majority may not be always right. Hence, Nehru suggested certain constitutional guarantees for the protection of the cultural and religious rights of the minorities in India. To quote him, "In a vast and varied country like India, a simple type of democracy giving full power to a majority to curb or over-rule minority groups in all matters was not satisfactory or desirable even if it could be established." In a democracy, wrong persons can be elected political leaders. This did not make Nehru pessimistic. He suggested that the democratic state must take the risk of even choosing wrong people by the right method and hope for the best.

To begin with, Nehru criticised the two-party system of England on the ground that the voter was left with very little choice and the members elected were subservient to their respecive parties, thus lacking independent thinking. Later on, he changed his view and stated that disciplined political parties were necessary for efficient Government and also for representing the masses. Nehru always emphasised the role of the Indian National Congress as the agent for cementing national unity. To quote him, "It is still the historic destiny of the Congress to labour for the real national unity of India in the present time of crisis."

Nehru's concept of democracy revolved round certain governmental institutions and principles viz., popular sovereignty through representatives, election by adult franchise, majority rule, responsible political parties and

leadership. His view was that democracy would be extinct if these vital elements were destroyed.

(c) According to Nehru, social and economic equality can be achieved only gradually. The principle of politial equality is far from democratic. The machinery of democracy was exploited to keep in saddle a class Government which stood for furthering its own interests. The Directive Principles of State Policy in the new Constitution of India are a clear move towards a classless and casteless society.

Nehru condemned the entire structure of the caste system which stands in the way of social equality in India. The caste system is wholly incompatible, reactionary, restrictive and a barrier to progress.

(d) As regards demoracy as social self-discipline, Nehru wrote, "Democracy was the way of self-discipline. Democarcy as such must have a background and basis in the masses of the people in their education." Democracy involves self-discipline of the community. Self-discipline requires acceptance by the minority of what is agreed upon by the majority after discussion.

According to Nehru, democracy means tolerance and the employment of peaceful methods. Tolerance indicates the willingness to recognise the existence of different points of view and allow the strongest view to prevail. Nehru put great emphasis on the employment of peaceful methods in a democratic state.

Nehru had faith in democracy as a way of life and a basis of social structure. His definition of democracy was not a narrow one. To him, democracy did not mean only the existence of a few political institutions, but a dynamic society giving full opportunities to the individuals for their development. His basic faith in the dignity of man led him to have faith in the democratic system of Government. During the Freedom Struggle, his aim was to win freedom for the entire people in the real sense of the term. He regarded the people as partners in everything and not partners in a totalitarian way. He wanted the people as individuals united for the welfare of the people. The faith of Nehru in democracy was strengthened as a result of the rise of Fascism and Nazism in Europe. He became bitter against Fascism and Nazism and also against those who were prepared to compromise with the enemy at the cost of democratic ideals. He saw before his eyes the murder of democracy in Spain and the betrayal of Czechoslovakia. Nehru's contention was that the creeds of Fascism and Nazism were narrow and were based on hatred and violence. He watched their growth and fall in their respective countries.

Nehru conceded that all human beings were not equal in respect of their ability or capacity to all people who have an equality of opportunity and be in a position to go as far as they could. He did not want to copy the democratic procedures or institutions of other countries as those democracies themselves required change. He wanted to discover avenues for improvement and have such a system which would fit in with the temper of the people and was acceptable to them.

European Governments had been cautious about the extension of franchise and till recent times, universal adult suffrage continued to arouse suspicion even in Great Britain. Nehru would give to the people first universal adult suffrage and then provide for their education and a good

standard of living. His view was that any talk of restricted franchise was out of the question, however illiterate or poor a people may be. When India became independent, the right of vote was given to every adult in India.

According to Nehru, Parliament was sovereign as it was elected by the people. The vast majority of the measures considered and passed by Parliament were in a way considered by all the people in the country. By and large, Parliament or Government does what it thinks reasonable without really referring to the people. So long as it gives the impression that democracy has been preserved and the people are being consulted and their wishes respected, all is well.

Democracy does not mean that the Government will be afraid of the people and the people will be jealous of their power. As the Government and the people inseparably constitute a democratic state, they must trust each other. If that happens, the responsibilities of the Government become the responsibilities of the people.

Nehru was opposed to regimentation and authoritarianism. He wanted democracy to be run successfully in India. He was not opposed to many political parties representing different viewpoints.

According to Nehru, democracy ensures free expression and freedom of thinking. It also demands unified action afterwards. It demands the acceptance of the decisions taken. If that is not so, there is no democracy.

Parliamentary democracy demands many virtues such as ability, devotion to work, self-discipiline and restraint. Democracy has been regarded as a means towards an end and that end, according to Nehru, is "the good life for the individual", which implies a certain satisfaction of the essential economic needs which relieve him from continuous oppression.

According to Nehru, democracy and peaceful ways of change are inseparable. Nehru had unshakeable faith in peace. The system of democracy can be worked only by the consent of the community as a whole. Conflicts may arise on account of different economic interests but those conflicts have to be resolved. Economic demoracy implies more or less economic equality and that demands from the rich the sacrifice of their class interests. That is the only way to avoid violence.

Democracy gives the individual an opportunity to develop in any way he likes but that does not mean inviting anarchy. There must be some discipline which may be imposed from outside or be in the nature of self-discipline. Imposition from outside may take the form of one country governing another or an autocratic or authoritarian form of Government. In a proper democracy, discipline is self-imposed. There is no democracy, if there is no discipline.

The State

According to Nehru, the state is not an end in itself but only a means to an end and that end is to serve man. Political liberty is intended to give economic and social freedom to individuals. Nehru condemned the Machiavellian concept of state governing the people and keeping them down. A modern state cannot be on those foundations.

It is the duty of the state to protect the individual from foreign enemies or internal disorders and also to provide him with opportunities of progress, education, health, sanitation and generally everything that would give him the opportunity of fitting himself for such work as he was capable of.

According to Nehru, civilisation is built up on cooperation, forbearance and mutual collaboraiton. When a crisis comes and the state is afraid of some danger, the super-structure goes or is subordinated to the primary function of self-protection by force and violence. The army, the police and the prison come into prominence and prison is the nakedest form of a state in miniature. To quote Nehru, "However undesirable the violence of the state may seem, practical considerations lead him to believe that state violence is preferable to provide violence in many ways, for one major violence is far better than numerous petty private violences. State violence is also likely to be more or less ordered violence and thus preferable to the disorderly violence of private groups and individuals; for even in violence order is better than disorder except that this makes the state more efficient in its violence and powers of compulsion. But when a state goes off the rails completely and begins to indulge in disorderly violence, then indeed it is a terrible thing and no private or individual effort can compete with it in horror and brutality."

The view of Nehru is that some kind of state coercion is inevitable. It is not possible to reject violence altogether. "Violence is the very life-blood of the modern state and social system. Without the coercive apparatus of the state, taxes would not be realised, landlords would not get their rents and private proporty would disappear. The law, with the help of its armed forces, excludes others from the use of private property. The national state itself exists because of offensive and defensive violence." However violence must be used with reason. Nehru liked discipline in life and disliked anarchy, disorder and inefficiency. He was a firm believer in law and order which a state was required to preserve. However, at times Nehru became rather doubtful about the value of law and order which was imposed by the Government upon the people.

According to Nehru, a good Government can be judged by its efficiency in production, consumption and the activities which raise the physical, spiritual and cultural standards of the people. Nehru had absolute faith in good Government and even preferred it to self-Government. He believed in a welfare state. The state was to aim at the welfare of all the individuals. The Constitution of India was drafted and adopted under his leadership and that aims at raising the standard of living of the masses, banishing of poverty and eradicating unemployment. The backward classes have to be looked after. The level of nutrition has to be raised. Cottage industries have to be encouraged to help the people living in rural areas. Everything should be done to raise the standards of the villagers.

Nehru believed not only in village uplift but also in big industries and machinery to make India self-sufficient. He believed that India could not become politically or economically self-sufficient till she industrialised herself and made full use of modern science and technology. To quote him, "I am all for the tractors and big industry and I am convinced that

rapid industrialisation of India is essential to relieve the pressure on land, to combat poverty and raise the standard of living and a variety of other purposes.."

Nehru not only aimed at the economic uplift of the people but also believed in cultural and spiritual values of life. He is considered as a cultural ambassador of spiritual East to the material West. To quote Nehru, "Our final aim can only be a classless society with equal economic justice and opportunity for all, a society organised on a planned basis for the raising of mankind to higher material and cultural levels, to a cultivation of spiritual values and of cooperation, unselfishness, the spirit of service, the desire to do right, goodwill and love—ultimately a world order."

Nehru advocated local self-Government at the village level. To quote him, "The village can no longer be self-contained economic unit but it can very well be governmental and electoral unit, each such unit functioning as a self-governing community within the larger political frame-work and looking after the essential needs of the village. I feel sure that the village should be treated as a unit. This will give a truer and more responsible representation."

Nehru advocated full coordination between the activities of the Government and the popular will so that the purpose of the welfare state was served. It was the duty of the administrator to keep his fingers on the pulse of the people all the time. The people should feel that they were a part of the Government which was reflecting their wishes. To quote Nehru, "It is the activity of the people, it is the temper of the people and the cooperation that the people in general give that will solve these problems this way or that. And I tell you that the best of our laws or activities of the Government can be, if not nullified, lessened greatly in effect if there is no will to work in the people or to cooperate to that end. And I tell you also that even an enfeebled Government, even a bad political Government can yield greater results in the country if people cooperate to that end."

Nehru believed that the ideal of the welfare state was to be achieved through peaceful methods. As a matter of fact, the Zamindari system was abolished, basic and key industries were nationalised and big changes were made in the Indian villages through peaceful methods. There was no resort to force. Nehru did not believe in imposing a plan or policy upon the people.

Secularism

Nehru was the chief architect of Indian secularism. He did his best to convert religion-bound Indian society into a modern secular state. Chester Bowles writes, "One of his greatest achievements is the creation of a secular state in which the forty-five million Muslims who chose not to go to Pakistan may live peacefully and worship as they please." (Ambassador's Report, p. 104).

Nehru had no attraction for religion as the basis of social and political status. He looked at the beliefs of others as personal matters. The concept of monolithic state dominated by a single religion and culture was not

acceptable to him. He believed that India with many religions was to be saved from falling a prey to religious fanaticism and chauvinism. By making the state neutral in matters of religion, Nehru laid the foundations of a strong secular state. The ideal of the equality of all religions and a non-sectarian Government did not waver even when there was communal frenzy and violence in the country. As long as he was the Prime Minister of India, he would not allow her to become a Hindu state and he put down communal violence with a strong hand.

Nehru was not wedded to any dogma or religion. He believed in the innate spirituality of human beings. To him, religion was narrow and intolerant of other opinions and ideas. It was self-centred and egoistic. It was an obstacle in the way of moral and spiritual progress of a nation. In 1948, Nehru observed: "Do we believe in a national state which includes people of all religions and shades of opinion and is essentially secular as a state or do we believe in the religious theocratic conception of a state which considers people of other faiths as something beyond the pale." Nehru was inspired to set up a secular society in India.

There are many aspects of the concept of secularism. One is religious freedom. That means the giving of equal status to all religions in India. No religion was to be granted any special privilege. No community was to be deprived of its legitimate rights on the basis of religion. To quote Nehru, "We are building a free secular state where every religion and belief has full freedom and equal honour, whose every citizen has equal liberty and equal opportunity." All social evils and inequalities must be abolished.

A secular state has to be neutral in matters of religion. Nehru always condemned both Hindu Raj and Muslim Raj. He stood for people's Raj. He advocated a policy of co-existence.

Nehru believed in secularism in social life. His view was that the existence of different sets of laws governing different religious communities, was inconsistent with the ideal of a secular society. He stood for a uniform Civil Code for the entire Indian community without discrimination on the basis of caste and religion. Asoka Mehta writes, "To make the state secular in the narrow sense of it being neutral towards religion is one thing, to extend the process of secularisation to all areas of social life including law and politics is quite another. Here Nehru's approach was marked by caution particularly where sentiments of the main minority community were concerned."

According to Nehru, secularism is an attitude of mind. The realisation of the secular idea depends largely upon the attitude of the majority community towards minorities. Nehru asked the Indians to remember that "the interest and the well-being of the minorities are their sacred trust. If they fail in their trust, then they will injure not only the country but themselves." A narrow and aggressive attitude on the part of the majority opinion was not desirable. He wanted the minorities also to be tolerant.

Nationalism

In the words of M.C. Chagla, Nehru was a "nationalist because he

saw India as a whole and its people with all their differences as sharing a common heritage and tradition inherited down the centuries."

Nehru was a great nationalist but he did not propound any new theory of nationalism. He believed in the fundamental unity of India nurtured on cultural foundations "which were not religious in the narrow sense of the term." To quote Nehru, " Nationalism is essentially a group memory of past achievements, traditions and experiences and nationalism is stronger today than it has ever been. Whenever a crisis has arisen, nationalism has emerged again and dominated the scene and people have sought comfort and strength in their own traditions. One of the remarkable developments of the present age has been the re-discovery of the past and of the nation."

There were three foundations of the views of Nehru on nationalism. One of them was the racial arrogance of the British rulers in India towards the Indians and the personal experiences of Nehru himself. Nehru blamed the British Government for the exploitation and poverty of the people of India. He pointed out that wherever the British rule lasted for a longer period, there was more of poverty. He criticised the Permanent Settlement of Bengal. He believed that the plunder of Bengal facilitated the growth of the Industrial Revolution in England. Another root of Nehru regarded nationalism as a living force in the history of modern in India kept in their hands all initiative and control mechanisms. They took all the decisions and made the Indians their tools with no initiative of their own.

Nehru regarded nationailsm as a living force in the history of modern nations. Nationalism had its weaknesses but that did not make him pessimistic regarding the present or the future of nationalism. In the days of foreign domination, nationalism was an inevitable factor. To quote him, "For any subject country, national freedom must be the first and dominant urge; for India, with her intense sense of individuality and a past heritage, it was doubly so."

It is true that nationalism is essentially a group memory of past achievements, traditions and experiences, but it should not mean revivalism. The past is a source of inspiration to the nationalist in a broader sense. It contains the picture of the greatness of a country in order to create confidence in his mind for the present and for the future. However, a study of the past should not develop a narrow and reactionary outlook for a retreat to the institutions of the past. That would be the very negation of nationalism. Nehru was cautious against any diversion towards narrow-mindedness in the name of nationalism. The approach to the past ought to be rational. Nationalism should not lead to an uncritical examination of the past. Nehru wanted to change the outlook of the people of India and give them the garb of modernity. He was convinced that India possessed something very vital and enduring but there was a great deal that had to be scrapped and must be scrapped. He was aware of the evil arising out of too much attraction towards the past. He wanted the people to come to grips with the present. To quote him, "Some Hindus talk of going back to the Vedas; some Muslims dream of Islamic theocracy. Idle fancies, for there is no going back to the past; there is no turning back

even if this was thought desirable. There is only one-way traffic in Time."

Nehru tells us that during the freedom struggle, he often let himself be swayed by deeper emotions of nationalism and found inspiration from various heroic deeds of others either in India or elsewhere. To quote him, "Brick by brick has our national movement been built up and often on the prostrate bodies of her martyred sons has India advanced. The giants of old may not be with us, but the courage of old is with us still and India can yet produce martyrs like Jatindas and Wizaya." It was through patriotic struggle and emotional vision that Nehru developed his nationalism. Behind his many years of struggle lay the desire to revitalize India. He was convinced that through action and self-imposed suffering and sacrifice, through voluntarily facing risk and danger, through refusal to submit to what people considered evil and wrong, the battery of India's spirit could be charged and she could be awakened from her long slumber. Nationalism appeared to him as something much bigger than what mere politics could make of it.

The supreme concern of Nehru during the later part of the freedom struggle was to achieve the unity of India as a nation. To him the unity of India was not merely an intellectual concept but an emotional experience. To quote him, "It was a unity of common subjection, but it gave rise to the unity of common nationalism. The idea of a united and free India gripped the people. It was not a superficial idea imposed from above but the natural outcome of that fundamental unity which has been the background of Indian life for thousands of years."

Nehru was convinced that differences in language could not stop the growth of nationalism in India. "One of the legends about India which our English rulers have persistently circulated all over the world is that India has several hundred languages", but Nehru exploded it as "a fiction of the mind of the philologists and the Census Commissioner who note down every variation in dialect and every petty hill-tongue as a separate language, although sometimes it is spoken only by a few hundred or a few thousand persons. If the census talks about the hundred of languages in India, it also points out that Germany has fifty or sixty languages. I do not remember any one pointing out this fact in proof of the disunity or disparity of Germany." To Nehru it appeared that India had fewer languages as compared with its area. It was far more closely allied with regard to language. Fifteen languages covered the whole of undivided India and out of those Hindi, with its variation Urdu, was by far the more widespread and understood even where it was not spoken. Whatever the number, Nehru was confident of the coming of one lingua franca for the whole of India and there was no danger to nationalism from that quarter.

To Nehru, there was no such thing as Hindu nationalism or Muslim nationalism. There was only one nationalism and that was Indian nationalism. The minorities in India were not racial or national minorities as in Europe but were religious minorities. The view of Nehru was that if nationality was based on religion, then there were not only two but many nations in India. The concept of religious nationalism was condemned by Nehru.

The independence of India brought a new spirit of nationalism to Nehru. Thereafter, nationalism meant to him an emotional integration of the entire people of India. To quote him, "We all belong to mother India and have to live and die here. We all are equal partners in the freedom that we have won. Every one of our three or four hundred million people must have an equal right to the opportunities and blessings that free India has to offer." Nehru was conscious of the weaknesses of the country and hence continued to lay stress everywhere on the unity of India and the need to fight communalism, provincialism, separatism and casteism. He went on reminding the people that there were no divisions between the North and South and East and West of India but there was only one India of which all the people were inheritors. The whole of India was the common heritage of every Indian. He reminded the nation of its great future which was also going to be a common feature. He called upon the people to stand up straight and look up at the skies, keeping their feet firmly planted on the ground and bring about the integration of the Indian people. To quote him, "Political integration has already taken place to some extent, but what I am after is something much deeper than that—an emotional integration of the Indian people so that we might be welded into one and made into one strong national unity, maintaining at the same time all our wonderful diversity." He wanted the people to make nationalism itself a common religion for all.

Nehru was a great nationalist and he took pride in his country but he did not allow his nationalism to tend towards any kind of irrationalism. To quote him, "I generally do not encourage the idea which is a peculiar product of intensive nationalism, of each person thinking his country as a chosen country of God—normally the people of each country think that they are the chosen people; whether it is in America or Europe or Asia, we all tend to think that we are the chosen people and all the others are outside the pale." He considered the extreme nationalist approach dangerous. "Some people talk of one nation, one culture, one language. That cry reminds me of the Fascist and Nazi slogans of old. We are one nation of course, but to try to regiment it in one way will mean discord and conflict and bitterness. It will put an end to the richness and variety of India and confine and limit the creative spirit and the joy in life of our people." Nehru's conception of Indian nationalism was a very lofty one. He wanted Indian nationalism to serve the cause of internationalism. To quote him, "We have to build up this great country into a mighty nation, mighty not in the ordinary sense of the word, that is, having great armies and all that, but mighty in thought, mighty in action, mighty in culture and mighty in its peaceful service of humanity."

Nehru devoted about 30 years of his glorious life for the liberation of his Motherland. Even as a young boy, he started resenting the presence and behaviour of the aliens in India. The news of the victory of Japan over Russia thrilled him and made him dream of the emancipation of his Motherland. "I dreamt of brave deeds of how sword in hand I would fight for India and help in freeing her." He was also stirred by the anti-Partition agitation in Bengal, the Swadeshi and boycott movements. He was deeply impressed by the Irish struggle for freedom and the heroic deeds of Garibaldi for the liberation of his country.

When Gandhiji started the Non-cooperation movement, Nehru was

arrested and tried by a magistrate. He told the magistrate, "We are fighting for freedom, for the freedom of our country and faith. We desire to injure no nation or people. We wish to have no dominion over others. But we must be perfectly free in our country. Jail has indeed become a heaven for us, a holy place of pilgrimage. To serve India in the battle of freedom is honour enough. What greater good fortune could befall an Indian unless it is death for the cause of the full realisation of our glorious dream."

It was under his Presidentship that the Indian National Congress passed a resolution for complete independence on 31 December 1929. Nehru asked the people of India to take the following pledge : "We believe that it is the inalienable right of the Indian people, as for any other people, to have freedom and to enjoy the fruits of their toil and have the necessaries of life so that they may have full opportunities of growth. The British Government in India has not only deprived the Indian people of their freedom but has based itself on the exploitation of the masses and has ruined India economically, politically, culturally and spiritually."

Nehru welcomed the nationalist movements in Egypt, Morocco, Indonesia, Algeria, Congo and Arabia. He did not agree with those who contended that nationalism was decaying and retreating before the sweeping tide of internationalism and the proletarian movement. His view was that true nationalism did not conflict with internationalism.

Nehru steered the ship of the state in spite of great hindrances in the form of communalism, provincialism, casteism and factionalism. He was against that concept of nationalism which produced a chauvinistic outlook and developed isolationist tendencies. He ridiculed that nationalism which generated hatred for other nations and fostered racialism, imperialism and wars among nations. To quote him, "Nationalism is good in its place but it is an unreliable friend and unsafe historian. It blinds us to many happenings and sometimes distorts the Truth especially when it concerns us or our country." The nationalism of Nehru permeated with an international outlook. He believed in co-existence. It is not correct to say that Nehru was an internationalist at the cost of nationalism. To quote him, "I am proud enough of my people, my country, my heritage but it is a narow-minded view to think that we are chosen people and all others are outside the pale." The nationalism of Nehru did not induce him to follow or advocate a policy of aggrandisement at the cost of others. Khwaja Ahmad Abbas writes about Nehru, "He was an Indian who had assimilated and integrated in his personality and character all that was best in the composite Indian culture and rejected all that was out of date, archaic or no longer of relevance to the modern times. But he had a healthy and undogmatic respect for the past of his country."

Internationalism

In the words of M. C. Chagla, "Nehru was a nationalist because he wanted his country to achieve the full status of nationhood, but in his hearts of heart, he was an internationalist and the whole world was the stage on which he wanted to play his part."

Nehru was a great nationalist and he spent a good bit of his life in fighting for India's independence but like the nationalism of Tagore, his

nationalism was pervaded with the spirit of internationalism. His nationalism was not exclusive. While he wanted to do everything for his country, he did not ignore the world. He linked up his nationalism with internationalism. To quote him, "I stand for Indian nationalism. I do so on a basis of true nationalism. We in India will gladly cooperate in a world order and even agree to give up a measure of national sovereignty, in common with others, in favour of a system of collective security." Dr. B. V. Keskar writes, "He was not however an opponent of nationalism. He had a broad human outlook and he realised that the frog in the pond mentality had isolated the Indian mind from the current of world thought. His internationalism envisaged cooperation and exchange of thought and experience amongst nations."

In 1927, Nehru attended the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities at Brussels as a representative of the Indian National Congress. That conference broadened his international outlook and he wrote to Gandhiji on 23 April 1927, "I welcome all legitimate methods of getting into touch with other countries and peoples so that we may be able to understand their view-point and world politics generally. I am afraid we are terribly narrow in our outlook and the sooner we get rid of this narrowness the better."

As the President of the Indian National Congress in 1929 at its Lahore session, Nehru observed, "And if we use the word independence, we do so in no sense hostile to a larger ideal. Independence for us means complete freedom from British domination and British imperialism. Having attained our freedom, I have no doubt that India will welcome all attempts at world cooperation and federation and will even agree to give up a part of her own independence to a larger group of which she is an equal member."

Nehru was a socialist and for him internationalism had a natural appeal. In October 1933, he said, "The struggle for Indian freedom is essentially a part of the world struggle for the emancipation of the exploited everywhere and for the establishment of a new social order." In 1934, Nehru envisaged the possibility of a world federation. To quote him, "If a world federation comes, that will be welcomed."

In June 1937, Nehru declared, "Nationalist as I am in regard to Indian freedom, I do not look upon contacts with other peoples from a narrow nationalist viewpoint. My very nationalism is based on an internationalism and I am very conscious of the fact that the modern world, with its science and world trade and swift methods of transport, is based on internationalism. No counrty or people can isolate themselves from the rest of the world, and if they attempt it, they do so at their peril and the attempt is bound to fail in the end." On another occasion, Nehru said, "What perhaps is not sufficiently realised is the international character of industrialism. It has broken down national boundaries and it has made each nation, however powerful it may be, dependent on other countries. The idea of nationalism is almost as strong today as it was and in its holy name wars are fought and millions slaughtered but it is a myth which is not in keeping with reality. The world has become internationalised, Production is international, markets are international and transport is international; and man's ideas continue to be governed by a dogma which has no real meaning today. No nation is really independent; they are all inter-dependent."

Nehru was against the idea of supernational states. He wrote in 1944, "For my part, I have no liking for a division of the world into a few huge supernational areas, unless they are tied together by some strong world bond. But if people are foolish enough to avoid world unity and some world organisation, then these vast supernational regions, each functioning as one huge state but with local autonomy, are very likely to take shape. For the small national state is doomed. It may survive as a cultural autonomous area but not as an independent political unit."

At the Asian Conference held in March 1947, Nehru declared, "We have arrived at a stage in human affairs when the ideal of One World and some kind of a World Federation seems to be essential, though there are many dangers and obstacles in the way." In a broadcast speech to the United States of America from New Delhi in April 1948, Nehru said, "I have no doubt in my mind that World Government must and will come, for there is no other remedy for the world's sickness. The machinery for it is not difficult to devise. It can be an extension of the federal principle, a growth of the idea underlying the United Nations, giving each national unit freedom to fashion its destiny according to its genius, but subject always to the basic covenant of the World Government."

In a message to the Herald Tribune Forum in 1949, Nehru said, "There can be no doubt that the World Government must come some time or the other. For, the only alternative to it is world suicide." In another speech, Nehru observed, "Internationalism demands that each country shall take an intelligent interest in world affairs and give up the desire to live in isolation from the rest. In this age of atomic weapons and sputniks, the only way to avoid the destruction of human civilisation is the free association of all nations in some type of world federation. Nationalism and internationalism must be balanced and harmonised in the interest of world peace and world unity."

In April 1950, Nehru said, "Nationalism, of course, is a curious phenomenon which at a certain stage in a country's history gives life, growth, strength and unity but, at the same time, it has a tendency to limit one, because one thinks of one's country as something different from the rest of the world. The perspective changes and one is continuously thinking of one's own struggles and virtues and failings to the exclusion of other thoughts. The result is that the same nationalism which is the symbol of growth for a people, becomes a symbol of the cessation of that growth in the mind. Nationalism, when it becomes successful, sometimes goes on spreading in an aggressive way and becomes a danger internationally. Whatever line of thought you follow, you arrive at the conclusion that some kind of balance must be found."

Nehru did not want internationalism at the cost of nationalism. To quote him, "In a contest between nationalism and internationalism, nationalism was bound to win. That had happened in every country and in every crisis; in a country under foreign domination, with bitter memories of continuous struggle and suffering, that was an inevitable and unavoidable consequence."

Nehru was against narrow nationalism. He wanted the spirit of nationalism to be directed in a proper channel. After Independence, Nehru began to cultivate the spirit of internationalism among the people

of India. He declared the future nature of his country's nationalism in these words: "Whatever confusion the present may contain, in the future India will be a land, as in the past, of many faiths equally honoured and respected, but of one national outlook, not, I hope, a narrow nationalism living in its own shell, but rather the tolerant creative nationalism which, believing in itself and the genius of its people, takes full part in the establishment of an international order."

There are certain hindrances in the way of the growth of true internationalism. One hindrance is the mutual fear and hatred between countries. If a mind is clouded by fear and hatred, it cannot think clearly. To quote Nehru, "If a country is consumed with hatred and fear, then its mind is clogged. It cannot think straight. In the United States, there is no clear thinking about Russia just as there is no clear thinking in Russia about the United States because the minds of both are clogged with indignation, with fear and hatred of each other. If they come to know each other more, hatred and misconception will go."

Another obstacle in the way of internationalism is narrow and aggressive nationalism. To quote Nehru, "While individuals and small groups could become international-minded and could be persuaded to sacrifice personal and group interests for a larger cause, nations could not. International interets can arouse enthusiasm in a country only if they are in line with national interests."

Michael Brecher writes about Nehru, "For many Westerners, he is one of the few voices of sanity as the world hovers on the brink of disaster. For many he is genuine voice of peace. In the nineteenth century, he may be compared to Cavour with an admixture of Garibaldi, i.e., a nation-builder with the dash of the romantic naitonalist. To this might be added Wilson in the twentieth century the spokesman for idealist internationalism." (Nehru: A Political Biography, p. 630).

Non-Alignment

As Prime Minister of free India, Nehru was very emphatic about his policy of non-alignment. This policy implied a refusal to accept definite commitment or to join a system of pacts or alliances committing India on one side or the other. Such a policy did not imply pacifism or isolation. It was not based on a desire to build up "a third force" or "a third bloc." Non-alignment did not mean a policy of neutrality in the accepted sense of the term. It did not mean sitting on the fence or a refusal to examine or even to take sides. It was not a cloak for partiality towards the West or the Communist countries. Its neutrality was not negative or static. It was rather positive and dynamic.

The policy of non-alignment was explained by Nehru in these words: "Our policy is not to commit ourselves previously to follow a certain line. Our policy is independence of action. If we say we are permanently neutral, it has no meaning except permanent retirement from public affairs in the national sense, Sanyas. No country can do that and certainly we have no desire to retire from world affairs." Again, "In the sphere of foreign affairs, India will follow an independent policy, keeping away from the power politics of groups aligned against one another. She will uphold the principle of freedom for dependent peoples and will oppose racial distinction

wherever it may occur. She will work with the other peace-loving nations for international cooperation and goodwill without exploitation of one nation by another. The use of the word neutral to describe India's foreign policy is wrong except in terms of war. If you say there is a war today, we are neutral. If you say there is a cold war, we are certainly neutral. We do not propose to join that war. It does not matter who is right and who is wrong. The preservation of peace forms the central aim of India's policy. It is in the pursuit of this policy that we have chosen the path of non-alignment. This does not mean passivity of mind or action, lack of faith or conviction. It does not mean submission to what we consider evil. It is a positive and dynamic approach to such problems as confront us. We believe that each country has not only the right to freedom but also to decide its own policy and way of life. We believe in non-aggression and non-interference by one country in the affairs of another and the growth of tolerance between them and the capacity for peaceful co-existence."

There were certain basic theoretical and practical considerations behind this policy of non-alignment. India had just become independent and she had to concentrate on economic and social reconstruction and hence she could not afford to get entangled in the power politics of the great nations. Non-alignment was a natural policy for India to follow. Non-alignment was also supported on historical grounds. India had always followed a policy of peace and non-alignment was considered to be the political expression of India's traditional philosophy of peace and goodwill for all. Non-alignment was also supported by the prevailing situation in the world which was divided into two camps and Nehru would not like to join any of the two.

Socialism

Nehru was born and brought up in an aristocratic family and his outlook was entirely bourgeois till 1920. It was in 1920 that he came into contact with the peasant movement in Oudh. He stayed with the Kisans for 3 days and had an opportunity to be acquainted with their sufferings. Nehru writes, "Looking at them and their misery and overflowing gratitude, I was filled with shame at my easy-going and comfortable life and petty politics of the city which ignored this vast multitude of semi-naked sons and daughters of India. A new picture of India seemed to rise before me naked, starving, crushed and problems utterly miserable." This ultimately led to Nehru becoming a socialist.

In 1927, Nehru attended the Congress of Oppressed Nationalities at Brussels as a representative of the Indian National Congress. This Congress helped Nehru to come into contact with many labour organisations from different parts of the world. He was very much impressed by Communism. In November 1927, he visited the Soviet Union. He was impressed by the Communist efforts to fight against poverty, disease and illiteracy. However, he did not approve of the brutal treatment given to the political prisoners in the Soviet Union. The conclusion of Nehru was that "without social freedom and a socialistic structure of society and the state, neither the country nor the individual could develop much."

In his Presidential address to the Indian National Congress in December

1929, he declared, "I must frankly confess that I am a socialist and a republican and not a believer in kings and princes or the order which produces the modern kings of industry who have greater power over the lives and fortunes of men than even kings of the old, and whose methods are as predatory as those of the old feudal aristocracy. I recognise, however, that it may not be possible for a body constituted as is this national Congress, and in the present circumstances of the country, to adopt a full socialistic programme. But we must realise that the philosophy of socialism has gradually penetrated the entire structure of society the world over and almost the only points in dispute are the pace and methods of advance to its full realisation. India will have to go that way too if she seeks to end her poverty and inequality though she may evolve her own methods and adapt the ideal to the genius of the race." Nehru was able to bring Gandhiji round to his point of view. A resolution on fundamental rights was passed at the Karachi session of the Congress and that resolution opened with the following declaration : "This Congress is of opinion that in order to end the exploitation of the masses, poliitcal freedom must include economic freedom of the starving millions."

In his Presidential address in April 1936, Nehru observed, "I am convinced that the only way to the solution of the world's problems and of India's problems lies in socialism and when I use this word I do so not in a vague humanitarian way but in the scientific economic sense. Socialism, however, is even more than economic doctrine; it is a philosophy of life and as such it appeals to me. I see no way of ending the poverty, the vast unemployment, the degradation and the subjection of the Indian people, except through socialism that involves vast and revolutionary changes, the feudal and autocratic Indian state system, that means the ending of private property except in a restricted sense and the replacement of the present profit system by a higher ideal of cooperative service. It means ultimately a change in our instincts and habits. In short, it means a new civilisation radically different from the present capitalist order. Some glimpse we can have of this new civilisation in the territories of the USSR. Much has happened there which has pained me greatly and with which I disagree; but I look upon that great and fascinating unfolding of a new order and a new civilisation as the most promising feature of our dismal age. If the future is full of hope, it is largely because of Soviet Russia and what it has done; and I am convinced that if some world catastrophe does not intervene, this new civilisation will spread over the other lands and put an end to the wars and conflicts which capitalism feeds.

"I do not know however when this will come to India. I imagine that every country will fashion it after its own way and fit it in with national genius. But the essential basis of that order must remain and be a link in the world order that will emerge out of the present chaos. Socialism is thus for me not merely an economic doctrine which I favour; it is a vital creed which I hold with all my head and heart. I work for Indian independence because the nationalist in me cannot tolerate alien domination. I work for it even more because for me it is the inevitable step to social and economic changes. I should like the Congress to become a socialist organisation and to join hands with the other forces in the world who are working for the new civilisation."

Writing to Subhas Chandra Bose in 1939, Nehru referred to his own inner contradiction with Marxism thus: "Am I a socialist or an individualist, is there a necessary contradiction in the two terms? I suppose, I am temperamentally and by training an individualist and intellectually a socialist. I hope that socialism does not kill or suppress individuality; indeed I am attracted to it because it will release innumerable individuals from economic and cultural bondage."

The address of Nehru to the business community on 4 March 1949 and the All-India Congress Committee on 4 January 1957 clearly indicates his pragmatic approach and his conception of democratic socialism. He declared that the method which delivered the goods and satisfied the masses would justify itself. As a keen observer, he realised that in many countries the old style capitalism was being modified towards democratic socialism. Hence, he did not attribute some rigid definition to socialism. However, his opinion was that democratic socialism meant three things viz., the substitution of cooperation in place of acquisitiveness, equal opportunities for development of personality for every one and the democratic process of peaceful and legitimate methods to achieve those two goals. He advocated a pragmatic approach to the problems facing the country.

The declaration of Industrial Policy on 7 April 1948 was a significant announcement of Nehru Government. Public ownership was to be complete in munitions, atomic energy and railways and in six other industries. Those industries were coal, iron and steel, aircraft manufacturing, shipbuilding, telegraphic and telephonic materials and minerals. The rest of the industrial field was left open for private enterprise. One thing was clear from the industrial policy resolution that the Government was committed to a public sector, howsoever restricted and confined it may be.

Nehru visited China in 1954 and what he saw there provided him new inspiration and new enthusiasm. On 9 November 1954, he spoke to the National Development Council and tilted the balance in favour of the public sector. Talking of private enterprise on 21 December 1954, Nehru declared in Lok Sabha, "But it is obvious in a country as under-developed as ours that we cannot progress except by state initiative, except by enlarging the public sector, but except by controlling the private sector at important points. It is very necessary that the private sector should function under certain broad strategic controls, but otherwise, with freedom and with initiative. The private sector is a part of the Plan, a coordinated part; this is where the strategic control comes in. I do not want to limit the public sector at all anywhere. The Finance Minister calls this a pragmatic approach. It is pragmatic in the sense that the pragmatic approach itself looks into a certain direction and has certain objectives. Otherwise, it is based on an objective consideration of things as they are."

In January 1955, U. N. Dhebar moved the Resolution on the Socialistic pattern of society at the Avadi session of the Indian National Congress. The Resolution runs thus: "Planning should take place with a view to the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society where the principal means of production are under social ownership or control, production is progressively speeded up and there is equitable distribution of the national wealth." It was added that the public sector must play a progressively greater role. Nehru declared that the Resolution on the Socialistic Pattern

Nehru accepted the view of Lenin that modern imperialism is the consequence of capitalist accumulation and its tendency to expansion. He did not show much interest in the labour theory of value and the theory of surplus value. He was opposed to the philosophy of dialectical materialism. The dialectical concept of matter in motion as the ultimate reality did not satisfy him. He refused to ascribe a purely sociological and class-character to ethical proposition. As a champion of freedom, he did not approve of the hostility and brutalities of the Communists in actual practice. He did not approve of the Russian aggression in Finland in 1939. He also did not approve of the bloody purges of Stalin. In 1952, Nehru expressed the view that a hundred years of development in the fields of philosophy, science and economic thought had made Marxism out of date. As Nehru continued to advance in age, his attachment to Communism became less and less. In 1950, he called the Communist movement in Asia as an enemy of nationalism. He did not approve of the Communist philosophy of class-war. He had his faith in peaceful methods for the change of society on socialistic lines.

Nehru on Revolution

Nehru put great emphasis on the role of revolutions in the history of the world. He pointed out that in the history of the world, there was a revolution after revolution "not because any group or person is a lover of bloodshed and anarchy and disorder but because of the desire for greater security for larger number of persons." Revolutions aim at the well-being of the vast majority of the people and are a means to an end which is social security and stability. Until that end is reached, society continues to struggle. The greater the urge to social security and stability, the healthier and more vital is the society. Without that urge, society becomes static and lifeless and gradually withers away. "So long, therefore, as the world is not perfect, a healthy society must have the seeds of revolt in it. It must alternate between revolution and consolidation."

The view of Nehru was that revolutions do not cost the society a great deal. Although the French Revoluiton was a terrible thing, it was a flee-bite compared to the chronic evils of poverty and unemployment. To quote him, "The Terror of French Revolution looms large because many titled and aristocratic persons were its victims and we are so used to honouring the privileged classes that our sympathies go out to them when they are in trouble. It is well to sympathise with them as with others. But it is also well to remember that they are just a few. We may wish them well. But those who really matter are the masses and we cannot sacrifice the many to a few."

According to Nehru, the desire for a better and healthier order in society leads to discontent which in turn may lead to revolution. As greater security follows the change, discontent and dissatisfaction, judged by their ultimate result, are good. If the people are not dissatisfied with their existing conditions, there is no revolution and society becomes static. "It is not those who are continually seeking security and have made a god of discretion who reform the world. It is not the sleek and shiny people having more than their share of this world's goods who are the apostles of change. The world changes and progresses because of those who are disaffected and dissatisfied and who are not prepared to tolerate the evils

and injustice of things as they are or have them." Those who are satisfied, have no desire to change. It is the dis-satisfied who become the standard-bearers of revolt against all that is evil.

The view of Nehru was that revolution at times has to be radical. Revolutionary changes cannot be brought about by the tactics and methods of the reformists. The reformer is afraid of radical change or overthrowing an oppressive regime. When it is necessary, the people should cultivate a revolutionary outlook. The degree of radicalism depends on the nature of the suffering of the people. If the suffering is great, the fire of revolution burns within the people and demands immediate remedies. Unless the suffering is removed, the fire burns. "Leaders and individuals may come and go; they may get tired and slacken off; they may compromise or betray; but the exploited and suffering masses must carry on the struggle, for their drill-sergeant is hunger."

Nehru did not find sanctity behind the political systems or orders which did not stand for the welfare of the people. If institutions or systems were without popular sanction behind them, revolution was perfect justified in abolishing them. The people could not be expected to keep on their chains of slavery imposed on them by force and fraud and submit to a system which crushed the life-blood out of them.

The view of Nehru was that a revolution against foreign rule was unavoidable. "No living nation under alien rule can ever be at peace with its conqueror. For peace means submission and submission means the death of all that is vital in the nation." Great empires of history, based on subject populations, contained in them germs of revolution. Nehru referred to the examples of the Roman Empire and the British Empire and pointed out that the inherent defect in them was that "they fatten on the exploitation of the many." Nehru also pointed out that from the day India was included in the British Empire, there had always been people who struggled for independence and sacrificed their all for the same. There cou'd be no end to a foreign rule except by revolution. "Ruling powers and ruling classes have not been known in history to abdicate willingly." Foreign rule arrested the normal development and starved spiritual and cultural development.

Nehru also pointed out that even after the liberation of the country from foreign yoke, the revolution did not stop. Struggle for political liberty is only one phase of the revolution and there has to be a struggle to eradicate the many ills from which a country suffers. After the Independence of India, he considered himself and his companions as the children of the Indian Revolution and also felt the urge to work in the same revolutionary spirit in removing poverty and raising the standard of the people and giving them full and equal opportunities for growth and development. Nehru observed thus in 1955, "We are still the children of the Indian Revolution. We have not ceased to be revolutionaries." By revolution, Nehru meant progress and change.

The view of Nehru was that revolution was not necessarily destructive. The view that in order to have progress, one must destroy, was not correct. The idea that by increasing conflict and bitterness one can have a clean slate to write upon, did not appeal to his mind. "No country has ever had slate to write upon, not even after the biggest of revolutions. No

one should deliberately destroy something which is worthwhile in order to build something which may be good in certain circumstances."

While Nehru believed in radicalism in the case of revolutions for political liberty from alien rule or for freedom from autocratic Governments, he advocated the adoption of constitutional methods in a free country. In a free and stable country, it was better to develop the idea of measured or ordered progress. Revolution in a violent form in a free country runs a great risk. "Once you enter the region of trying to settle problems by violent methods, you go towards something that is perilously near to civil war."

After working as a practical revolutionary for the major part of his life, Nehru was influenced by the Gandhian philosophy of revolution. He worked as a revolutionary with the philosophy of Gandhi mixed up with that of his own. Nehru accepted the view of Gandhiji that means were as important as the end itself. He admired the moral and ethical side of the national movement in India and the Satyagraha on which Gandhiji put great emphasis. The spiritualisation of politics as advocated by Gandhiji, appealed to his mind. He became a firm believer in the virtues of righteous means. "A worthy end should have worthy means leading upto it. That seemed not only a good ethical doctrine but sound, practical politics, for the means that are not good often defeat the end in view and raise new problems and difficulties." It was degrading to the self-respect of an individual of a nation to resort to ignoble means. He was proud of Gandhiji and his emphasis on means.

As the means were regarded as even more important than the end, some definite revolutionary methods were invented to justify that principle and one of them was that revolution was made open. All the cards of the Congress leaders were always on the table and there was no secrecy about them. It was felt that secrecy did not fit in with the spirit of civil disobedience movement and it produced a damping effect on the mass consciousness. In July 1933, Gandhiji condemned all secrecy in Indian revolution and Nehru agreed with him. Nehru also pointed out that under certain exceptional circumstances, it might be desirable for local or provincial committees or groups to issue bulletins of directions etc. secretly but Gandhiji did not agree with that view.

Nehru invited self-suffering by living on parched rice and roasted gram and by travelling in third class railway compartments in the burning summer. Nehru wrote, "We put on a grave face in goal or outside and smiled and laughed but we smiled often through our tears and our laughter was sometimes near to crying." Nothing was more irritating and harmful to a Government than to have to deal with people who would not bend to its will, whatever the consequences. To quote Nehru, "For us the choice is: abject submission to the power of the state, spiritual degradation, the denial of the truth that is in us and our moral prostitution for purposes that we consider base—or opposition with all the consequences thereof. No one likes to go to gaol or to invite trouble. But often gaol is preferable to the other alternative."

The Gandhian philosophy of non-violence, though followed by Nehru in practice, created grave doubts in his mind. He wondered if national and social groups could imbibe sufficiently the individual creed of non-

violence as it involved a tremendous rise of mankind to a high level of love and goodness. "I dislike violence intensely and yet I am full of violence myself and consciously or unconsciously, I am often attempting to coerce others." Nehru found it difficult to draw a line between violence and non-violence and considered that often enough moral force was a far more terrible coercive factor than physical violence. As regards non-violence being synonymous with truth, he found himself in great difficulty. He was not prepared to identify wholly truth with non-violence. He did not consider violence as intrinsically immoral.

Nehru did not want to carry the doctrine of non-violence to its extreme end. When Gandhiji suspended the Non-cooperation movement in 1922 on account of violence at Chauri Chaura, Nehru protested. "Chauri Chaura may have been and was a deplorable occurrence and wholly opposed to the spirit of the non-violent movement; but were a remote village and a mob of excited peasants in and out of the way place going to put an end, for some time at least, to our national struggle for freedom?" Nehru felt that it is impossible to train all the people of India in the theory and practice of non-violent action before the revolution could go forward. Even if the people were trained, the police could provoke them to violence. Considering such possibilities, Nehru felt that the non-violent method of resistance was bound to fail, but Gandhiji stuck to his view.

Nehru knew all that Gandhiji meant by non-violence. Non-violence was a dynamic method and was not a coward's refuge from action. It was the brave man's defiance of evil and national subjection. Nehru knew the inner meaning of non-violence of Gandhiji, but he could not accept it in its entirety because of its high idealism. To quote Nehru, "We were moved by these arguments (of Gandhiji), but for us and for the National Congress as a whole the non-violent method was not and could not be a religion or an unchallengable creed or dogma. It could only be a policy and a method promising certain results and by those results it would have to be finally judged. Individuals might make of it a religion or incontrovertible creed. But no political organisation, so long as it remained political, could do so."

While Gandhiji regarded non-violence as a highly ethical or religious principle, Nehru accepted it as a practical instrument to fight the British. "Armed rebellion seemed out of the question for the Indian people. We are disarmed and most of us did not even know the use of arms. Besides in a contest of violence, the organised power of the British Government of any state was far greater than anything that could be raised against it. Armies might mutiny but unarmed people could not rebel and face armed force." Nehru knew that people could be taught both violent and non-violent revolution, but realised that non-violent revolution would lead to better results. He advised the Congress to accept non-violent methods as a practical necessity. To quote Nehru, "Violence too often brings reaction and demoralisation in its train, and in our country especially it may lead to disruption. It is perfectly true that organised violence rules the world today, and it may be that we could profit by its use. But we have not the material or the training for organised violence and individual or sporadic violence is a confession of despair. The great majority of us, I take it, judge the issue not on moral but on practical grounds and if we reject the way of violence it is because it promises no substantial results."

As the non-violent revolution made progress in India, the faith of Nehru in non-violence increased. However, he did not develop a rigid and dogmatic attitude towards non-violence. He also did not accept it as a creed. "If this Congress or the nation at any future time comes to the conclusion that methods of violence will rid us of slavery, then I have no doubt that it will adopt them. Violence is bad but slavery is far worse." Nehru made it clear on many occasions that non-violence was not an infallible creed with him. "I prefer freedom with violence to subjection with non-violence."

Nehru believed that non-violent revolution required training for the masses. As the years went on, training made the revolution a very powerful and organised affair. The country became more and more disciplined and there was a clear appreciation of the nature of the struggle. The people understood the technique of revolution and fully realised that there was absolute earnestness about non-violence. There was the possibility of youngmen turning to violence but the Congress went on reminding the country of its basic policy of non-violence and warned them against any breach of it. When the Quit India movement was launched in 1942, it become difficult for the people to remain absolutely non-violent, but the doctrine of non-violence pervaded the atmosphere. To quote Nehru, "The people forgot the lesson of non-violence which had been dinned into their ears for more than twenty years and yet they were wholly unprepared, mentally or otherwise for any effective violence. That very teaching of non-violent methods produced doubt and hesitation and came in the way of violent action." Again, "In spite of the passions aroused, there was very little, if not, racial feeling, and, on the whole there was a deliberate attempt on the part of the people to avoid causing bodily injury to their opponents. There was a great deal of destruction of communications and governmental property, but even in the midst of this destruction, care was taken to avoid loss of life."

Nehru was opposed to terrorism as a means to bring about revolution in India. As early as May 1923, he declared that individual terrorism and the killing by bomb or pistol of individual officers was "a bankrupt's creed". "It was demoralising for the people and it was ridiculous to think that it could shake a powerfully organised Government, however much it might frighten individuals."

According to Nehru, terrorism usually represented the infancy of a revolutionary urge in a country. In India, terrorism flourished at the beginning of the struggle against foreign rule. As the national movement advanced and its non-violent phase appeared, the philosophy behind terrorism quickly vanished. The people became hostile to the idea of terrorism as a method of political action. It was not the Government coercion which killed terrorism but other basic causes and world events did that. Nehru tried to impress upon others that terrorism was an outworn and profitless method which hindered real revolutionary action. In 1931, Nehru discussed the question of terrorism in a number of public meetings in Bengal and tried to show how wrong, futile and harmful it was for Indian freedom. It is said that the terrorists were angry with him and warned him that he might be disposed of like others if he continued his propaganda.

Although Nehru criticised terrorism as a political faith and terrorist action, there was some kind of humane feeling in him towards the courage of the individuals who sacrificed their lives for the Motherland. He praised the bravery of Bhagat Singh in spite of his terrorist method. To quote him, "My heart is full of admiration for the courage and self-sacrifice of a man like Bhagat Singh. Courage of the Bhagat Singh type is exceedingly rare".

The view of Nehru was that the process of change should not be delayed if a revolution is to be avoided. Progress must be rapid "to maintain hope". The people could be expected to put up with some delay if they knew that they were going towards something and not otherwise.

Nehru believed that in making the people accept changes, both the legislative influence and the influence of a direct approach to them should be taken into account. Some revolutionary changes can be brought about in society through legislation but in certain cases resort must be taken to propaganda and persuasion.

According to Nehru, the ultimate objective of all revolutions is the emancipation of mankind. Many countries were struggling for their rightful place in the human family and many others were passing through trials and tribulations. With faith in new forces and ultimately in the human spirit, Nehru said, "The freedom that we envisage is not to be confined to this nation or that or to a particular people, but must be spread out over the whole human race. That universal human freedom also cannot be based on the supremacy of any particular class. It must be the freedom of the common man everywhere and full opportunities for him to develop."

Nehru and Gandhi

Both Nehru and Gandhiji were contemporaries and they worked together for the liberation of their country from foreign yoke. They had their differences and similarities but managed to work together as a team. If Gandhiji was the Father of the Nation, Nehru was his political heir. Gandhiji had so much liking for Nehru that he got him elected the President of the Indian National Congress in 1929 when he was only 40 years of age. As a matter of fact, Gandhiji had a hand in getting Nehru elected as the Congress President in 1946 and thereby enabled him to become the first Prime Minister of independent India.

As regards their *differences,* Nehru strongly criticised the suspension of the Non-cooperation movement by Gandhiji in 1922. Both of them did not see eye to eye on that occasion. Both Gandhiji and Nehru differed in their attitude of the Congress towards the Indian states ruled by the Indian princes. Their views differed on the question of national defence. Their views differed on the question of non-violence. Nehru did not believe that non-violence could destroy the monstrous war-machine built by Hitler. He did not accept non-violence as a method for all situations, for all times. Nehru believed that the coercive authority of the state was necesary for the preservation of law and order in the country and to repel foreign invasions.

The attitude of Nehru on life was secular and scientific and not religious as was the case with Gandhiji. Gandhiji was a great critic of Western civilisation based on technology and industrialisation but Nehru was enamoured of Western science and technology. He had great appreciation for the achievements of science and technology. To quote Nehru, "We cannot stop the river of change or cut ourselves adrift from it and psychologically we who have eaten the apple of Eden cannot forget the taste and go back to primitiveness". Gandhiji and Nehru differed in their composition and emphasis on the social idea. Gandhiji put emphasis on liberty but Nehru put emphasis on equality though both of them stood for liberty and equality. In the stateless society of Gandhiji, the individual was to enjoy unlimited freedom. However, the view of Nehru was that unrestricted freedom induces an individual to interfere with the freedom and rights of other individuals. In order to distribute freedom equally to all the members of society, it had to be rationed and each individual was to be given his legitimate share. Individual freedom was to be limited through collective planning and control. The ideal society of Nehru was designed by planning and governed by controls. Undue restrictions dwarfed the personality of the individual and hence the same was to be avoided.

Both Gandhiji and Nehru differed in their concepts of ideal life. "Both set off on their endless journey from the same starting point—selfless love of their fellowmen with the same object, realisation of truth and the same equipment, rigorous moral principles. But they adopt different styles of travelling, their destinations are wide apart and their ways identical for the present, tend to part ultimately." Gandhiji wanted to follow the ultimate goal of truth with single-minded concentration. Nehru attained the same goal pursuing the longer and circuitous way "full of turns and windings, ups and downs enjoying the fascinating panorama of diversity, taking delight in storms and stresses and yet seeking unity in diversity, harmony and calm in storm."

Gandhiji was essentially a religious man and he strayed into politics accidentally. Hence, he could not separate the two. He put great emphasis on truth and non-violence and expected the Congress to be instrumental for the moral and spiritual regeneration of the country. Nehru also attached importance to moral values but not so much to religion. He wanted the Indian National Congress to play its role effectively in the political and economic spheres. Gandhiji approached the West through Indian eyes while Nehru saw India through the Western eyes. Gandhiji was keen to preserve Indian culture but Nehru would like to change the same in the light of the new circumstances. Gandhiji wanted to banish Western civilisation from India but like to retain the Britishers as welcome friends in the service of the country. Nehru wanted to drive out the British but keep their culture and civilisation. Nehru gave an important place to private sector but did not accept the theory of trusteeship propounded by Gandhiji.

The withdrawal of the Civil Disobedience movement in 1922 by Gandhiji on a very trivial matter was a rude shock to Nehru who wrote thus, "But even if it was a serious matter, was a national movement involving scores of thousands directly and millions indirectly to be thrown out of gear because an individual had erred. This seemed to me a monstrous proposition

and an immoral one". Gandhiji wrote Hind Swaraj in 1909 and condemned the Western civilisation. Nehru criticised what was written by Gandhiji in Hind Swaraj and observed, "All this seems to me utterly wrong and harmful doctrine and impossible of achievement. Behind it lies Gandhiji's love and praise of poverty and suffering and the ascetic life. For him, progress and civilisation consist not in multiplication of wants or higher standard of living, but in the deliberate and voluntary restriction of wants which promotes real happiness and contentment and increases the capacity for service." Again, "Gandhiji is always thinking in terms of personal salvation and of sin while most of us have society's welfare uppermost in our minds. He is not out to change society or the social structure, he devotes himself to the eradication of sin from individuals." Basically, the premises on which they based their views were fundamentally different and thus their conclusions were different.

In his Autobiography, Nehru refers to his differences with Gandhiji. (1) Gandhiji's activities might lead one to think that he wants to go back to the narrowest autarchy, not only a self-sufficient nation, but almost a self-sufficient village. On the other hand, Nehru was led to the etablishment of socialist order, first within national boundaries and eventually in the world as a whole with a controlled production and distribution of wealth for the public good. (2) The Khadi movement, hand-spinning and hand-weaving which is Gandhiji's special favourite is an intensification of individualism in production and is thus a throw-back to the pre-industrial age. Nehru believed that there was no way to stop the industrial process and mass production. "For not only is our material and cultural progress bound-up with it but also our freedom itself." (3) Gandhiji fathered a policy on the Congress in regard to Indian states which was the policy of non-interference in the internal administration of the states. The view of Nehru was that this policy was unjust to the people residing in the Indian states. (4) Gandhiji suggested the principle of trusteeship for the Zamindars, princes and the propertied class. Nehru considered the Zamindari system as a semi-feudal system which was out of date and a great hindrance to production and general progress. Gandhiji made a few attempts to patch up his differences with Nehru and also made some concessions but still the differences remained because the differences were fundamental and basic.

A reference may be made to some of the *similarities in the view of Nehru and Gandhi.* Both Nehru and Gandhiji wanted India to be a secular state. To quote Gandhiji, "The state should undoubtedly be secular. Every one living in it should be entitled to profess his religion, without let or hindrance. There should be no interference with missionary effort but no mission could enjoy the patronage of the state as it did during the foreign regime." Gandhiji did not believe in state religion. Both Gandhiji and Nehru believed in the establishment of a liberal and democratic state. The ultimate goal of Gandhiji was a stateless society based on non-violence. As it was difficult to have a stateless society, Gandhiji was prepared to accept a democratic state with a bias towards non-violence during the interim period. Such a state was to use persuasion instead of coercion for bringing about social change. The welfare state of Nehru was also opposed to coercion and centralisation. It was to be democratic and federal in nature. Though Nehru was not wholly devoted to the concept of non-violence as

cherished by Gandhiji, he was very much attracted to its moral aspects. To quote him, "It attracted me more and more and the belief grew upon me that situated as we were in India and with our background and traditions, it was the right policy for us. The spiritualisation of politics seemed to me a fine idea". Nehru also abstained from violence in word and deed and probably in thought also. Gandhiji said of Nehru, "Jawaharlal is my political heir. He may differ from me while I am living, but when I am gone, he will begin speaking my language." As a matter of fact, after the death of Gandhiji, Nehru realised the full significance of non-violence and called upon the nations of the world to follow the principle of non-violence not as a policy but as a creed. The view of Nehru was that non-violence was the only creed which could save humanity from impending doom. In his speech in the United Nations Assembly, Nehru declared, "We do not think that the problems of the world or of India can be solved by thinking in terms of aggression or war or violence. We are frail mortals and we cannot always live up to the teachings of the great men who led our nation to freedom. But that lesson has sunk deep into our souls and so long as we remember it, I am sure, we shall be on the right path." Nehru acted upon this principle and did not join either of the two Power blocs into which the world was divided at the time. He also did not resort to violence in order to establish a welfare state in India. Nehru advocated large-scale industries and Gandhiji was also prepared to accept them provided those were located in the villages and were owned and controlled by the state and adequate arrangements were made for looking after the toiling classes. Both Gandhiji and Nehru put emphasis on self-reliance as one of the essential ingredients of the character of an individual. Both of them advocated keeping the door open for negotiations and peaceful settlement of disputes and conflicts. The nationalism of both was permeated by internationalism. Gandhiji did not want India to remain isolated from the rest of the world and the same was the view of Nehru. Both of them stood for toiling humanity. "One saw God in him, the other challenge to the fulfilment of his ideal. Though one was an ascetic and the other an aristocrat, they both loved their fellow-creatures and in return were loved by them in full measure. The hold of one was spiritual and of the other temporal, but it was exercised by both through the hearts of the people." Both were humanists. Both gave more importance to human qualities than to political expediency. Dr. Keskar writes of Nehru, "Let us not forget that he brought human values to become current coin even in politics. His contribution to our public life from that point of view is as great as that of Gandhi. He was a great political leader but an even greater as a man." Abid Hussain writes, "The patterns of new India conceived by Gandhiji and Nehru were different on the ideal plane, but on the plane of actual life where the ideal is modified by its impact on the real, they had become almost identical."

Both Gandhiji and Nehru dedicated their lives for the freedom of their country and ultimately came out successful. There were many reasons why Nehru was drawn towards Gandhiji. Nehru recognised the heroism and spirit of defiance of Gandhiji. He learnt to put emphasis on fearlessness among the people. He also found that Gandhiji's leadership and political action brought important results. Gandhiji acted as a bridge between the past ideals and the future modernising aspirations of India. Nehru also

pleaded for an integration between thought and action. He did not sympathise with the sky-roving intellectuals or the opportunists. Nehru was constantly influenced by Gandhiji. They had their ideological differences, but there was substantial agreement between the two. Nehru wrote about Gandhiji, "Ideologically he was sometimes amazingly backward and yet in action he had been the greatest revolutionary of recent times in India. He was a unique personality and it was impossible to judge him by the usual standards, or even to apply the ordinary canons of logic to him. But because he was a revolutionary at bottom and was pledged to political independence of India, he was bound to play an uncompromising role till that independence was achieved. And in this very process, he would release tremendous mass energies and would himself advance step by step towards the social goal."

When Gandhiji discontinued the Civil disobedience movement in April 1934, Nehru felt that the grounds put forward were frivolous. After the Lucknow Congress in 1936, Nehru accepted a Working Committee of the Congress which did not reflect his views. He was not in favour of accepting office under the Government of India Act, 1935 but he did so as desired by Gandhiji and other colleagues. He was in favour of coming to a settlement with Cripps in 1942 but Gandhiji opposed it and Cripps Mission failed. Nehru was not in favour of starting any movement against the British Government which was fighting against the Fascist Powers and tried to put a restraint on Gandhiji but ultimately he himself was persuaded by Gandhiji to move the Quit India resolution in August 1942. Gandhiji was opposed to the partition of India but he accepted the same after Nehru had accepted it.

Nehru had a sense of discipline and loyalty. He was against factionalism. He considered himself a disciplined soldier of the Congress and loyal to the leader, Mahatma Gandhi. He did entertain rebellious thoughts at times. On 18 July 1933, he wrote in Prison Diary: "I am getting more and more certain that there can be no further cooperation between Bapu and me." On 13 April 1934, he recorded in his prison cell at Calcutta, "After 25 years I go my way, perhaps a solitary way leading not far." However, the stray thoughts were ultimately overcome by Nehru's sense of discipline. Nehru had tried to organise an "Independence for India League" in the late twenties, but that did not succeed. While Nehru generally agreed with the Congress Socialist Party, he had no great faith in the ability of its members to deliver the goods. He regarded many of them as parlour socialists. It is true that he was aware of the weaknesses of the Congress which was essentially a bourgeois organisation and was dominated by the Conservatives. Nevertheless, the Congress with the large spectrum of opinion it offered, gave him sufficient flexibility for his views. As years passed by, Nehru was increasingly persuaded that socialism should be introduced by conversion and cooperation rather than by force. It is contended that neither the cause of independence of India nor of socialism would have been better advanced if Nehru had broken with the Congress. Though not a socialist himself, Gandhiji had unquestioned hold not only on the bourgeoisie but also on the masses, especially on the peasants and the poor on the countryside. Nehru also had immense popularity with the masses but at least a part of it was based on the support he got from Gandhiji.

To break away from Gandhiji and to lead a parallel movement would have been an act of adventurism, the effectiveness of which would have been doubtful. Socialism gained respectability and even acceptability by Nehru's association with Gandhiji. Gandhiji may not have been a socialist himself but his political vision was not very much away from it.

Gandhiji's efforts were directed to make Nehru accept some of the basic principles of his own thought rather than oppose outright the socialist views of Nehru. In this, Gandhiji did succeed to a measure. Faced with the responsibilities of office after the Independence of India and even earlier, much of Gandhism was blended with Nehru's thinking. Nehru was more articulate, more precise and more logical than Gandhiji in expressing his views on economic matters. Gandhiji often acted on his intuition or his "inner voive". It appeared that it was Nehru who was surrendering his views to Gandhiji. In fact, one influenced the other and it was the blend of the two sets of views that ultimately prevailed. It is rightly pointed out that both the Independence movement and the socialist movement gained by this attitude of Nehru. By the time Independence was attained, socialism had become a part of the ethos of the freedom struggle which could no longer be ignored. Nehru's Prime Ministership also helped the socialist tradition.

Estimate

According to Dr. Moin Shakir, Nehru is rightly described as "the whole man in the Renaissance conception." His romanticism, utopianism, insight into the human affairs and ability to identify the problems of the Indian society made him a perceptive thinker and an outstanding leader of the Indian people. He was perhaps the only leader who developed a comprehensive intellectual approach to the national question in India. He was never a blind follower of Gandhiji. He rightly understood the revolutionary role of Gandhiji in Indian politics. Nehru was not able to give concrete shape to the India of his dreams because he lacked firmness and the capacity to act decisively when action was called for. He recognised the dangerous potentialities of private property and capitalism and the wickedness of selfish interests and castigated them. There was a wide disparity between the promises and performance of Nehru. His capacity for positive action was paralysed by the shock of the Partition riots and he became a advocate of stability. He confessed that he was not gallant enough to go about destroying any more. As a thinker, Nehru can have very few equals. (Politics and Society, pp. 246-247).

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia wrote about Nehru, "The Liberal of Asia is a pompous phrase-maker, devoid of a base in reality. Socialist in speech and conservative in action, he declares a recurrent war on famine and keeps on promising self-sufficiency in food alongside of blaming his failures on skies that did not send rain. He contiunally threatens corruption and capitalism with destruction but reveals his true self of sanctimonious hypocrisy by distributing patronage, permits and loans. He is a lie and a fraud but always with charming and usual phrases." This is a wholly irresponsible criticism of Nehru and Dr. Lohia should have known and not concealed the amount of work done by Nehru in the difficult circumstances in which he was placed. Nehru accomplished what few human beings could have done in their life-time.

Critics maintain that the secularism of Nehru was against the Hindus. Nehru followed a policy of appeasement of the Muslims and ignored completely the interests of the Hindus who formed a majority in the country. He could have taken interest in the welfare of the Muslims but not at the cost of others. Here is another irresponsible criticism of Nehru: "In the name of secularism, we see the worst pampering to Pakistani communalism. Nehru thinks it more necessary to please a few Mullahs and inveterate Muslim Leaguers and his friends of Pakistan than look to the urgent needs of eight millions of helpless refugees from East and West Pakistan." The critic ought to have mentioned what was actually done by Nehru for the refugees. More could have been done if all had cooperated. D. F. Karaka who was otherwise a great critic of Nehru, wrote thus about him, "The basis of that honesty of purpose which enabled us to pull through that critical period was his uncompromising secular appeal which is almost an instinct with him". (Nehru The Lotus Eater from Kashmir, p.104).

S. A. Dange criticised the socialism of Nehru in these words: "He only protests emotionally. Nehru, the bourgeois sceptic, does not believe that there can be a society without exploitation of man by man, that it can be established only by socialising the means of production, distribution and exchange." Nothing better could be expected from a Communist who could not find anything good in what Nehru was doing in the direction of socialism. D. E. Smith writes in this connection, "Nehru sought to apply the basic principles of socialism to an under-developed country in which production was still the greatest economic problem. The shouting of doctrinaire slogans about nationalising everything in sight solved no problems; the principles of democratic socialism would have to be adapted to Indian conditions." In order to appreciate what Nehru did in this connection, a reference may be made to the following statements made by him in this connection: "I have no property sense. It seems a burden to me to carry property; it is a nuisance. In life's journey one should be lightly laden. One cannot be tied down to a patch of land or building. I cannot appreciate this intense attachment to property. But while not appreciating it, I realise and recognise its prevalence. At the same time I think its acquisition or confiscation without compensation seems to be basically wrong." Again, "I have been and am a convinced socialist and believer in democracy and have at the same accepted whole-heartedly the peaceful technique of non-violent action which Gandhiji practised so successfully." Nehru stood for "a society organised on a planned basis for the raising of mankind to higher material and cultural levels, to a cultivation of spiritual values, of cooperation, unselfishness, the spirit of service, the desire to do right, goodwill and love—ultimately a world order. Everything that comes in the way will have to be removed gently if possible, forcibly if necessary".

Critics maintain that the planning of Nehru was a failure. Its achievements were very little. However, it must be conceded that a lot was accomplished through planning but if an ideal target could not be reached, that was not the fault of Nehru. The circumstances in which he worked stood in the way of his progress. Regionalism, localism, conservatism, backwardness, poverty and ever-growing rise in the population of the country were some of those factors. Geoffrey Tyson writes,

"Nehru's basic philosophy of planning within a free society by and large stands justified and will surely rank as one of his main achievements for India". (Nehru, The Years of Power, p. 12). Nehru did a lot of work in the direction of Community Development Programme. Dr. Neeraj writes about Nehru, "Certainly, Community Development projects did not become real lamps spreading lights in the dark corners of India, yet his contribution lies in emphasizing the need for and importance of giving a new democratic orientation to village people by starting a massive programme of rural development". (Nehru and Democracy in India, p. 250).

There are certain critics who criticise the restrictions imposed by Nehru on the people of India. They refer to the provisions of Preventive Detention Act in that connection. However, it must be conceded that during the period of the stewardship of Nehru, the people enjoyed their liberties. If any restrictions were imposed, those were done in the interest of national security. Nehru allowed all types of criticism of his Government and he took action only when the security of the country was jeopardised. D. E. Smith writes, "Thus the rights of personal liberty and freedom of the press could not be considered in a vacuum nor in relation to conditions prevailing a hundred years ago in countries thousands of miles away, They had to be interpreted in terms of present day conditions in India".

Another criticism of Nehru is that he cared more for internationalism than for nationalism and subordinated the interests of his country for international considerations. The correct view is that Nehru was a great nationalist but at the same time he was an internationalist. His nationalism was not confined to his own country. He linked up nationalism with internationalism. That cannot be called a drawback.

The contribution of Nehru in the realm of Indian political thought lies in his attempt at sociological understanding of Indian history. He did not praise too much the past history of India but he tried to find out some deeper meaning in Indian history. He tried to find out the secret of the enduring vitality of India. He found that India had a marvellous capacity for rejuvenescence. He tried to interpret the happenings in India in the context of world situation. He was opposed to a policy of isolation. He brought about a synthesis of political and economic democracy. He had a scientific approach to the social, economic and political problems of India. He was a votary of reason and emancipation of the intellect. He was an advocate of modernism but detested revivalism. He was the enemy of communalism. During his stewardship, India made much progress in the industrial and technological fields. He urged the necessity of synthesizing physical sciences and industry with humanist toleration and compassion. He accepted the concept of scientific humanism. His humanism proceeded from his reactions to pain and misery. D. S. Smith writes about Nehru, "The world has known absolute dictators for millennia, constitutional rulers for centuries, democratic politicians for a century and a half and Bolsheviks for a generation. Today, the world is confronted by a new category. It is represented by a proud Asian nationalist who for thirty years struggled against Western colonialism and won. Yet his thinking is steeped in Western democratic traditions and he is committed to the ideals of socialism".

SUGGESTED READINGS

Ahluwalia, B.K. : *Jawaharlal Nehru : India's Man of Destiny.*

Appadorai, A. : *Indian Political Thinking in the Twentieth Century from Naoroji to Nehru*, Oxford, 1971.

Brecher, Michael : *Nehru : A Political Biography*, 1959.

Crocker, Walter : *Nehru : A Contemporary's Tribute*, London, 1966.

Das, M.N. : *The Political Philosophy of Jawaharlal Nehru*, London, 1961.

Dutt, R.C. : *Socialism of Jawaharlal Nehru*, New Delhi, 1981.

Edwardes, Michael : *Nehru : A Political Biography*, London, 1971.

Gopal, S. : *Jawaharlal Nehru : A Biography.*

Hussain, S. Abid : *The Way of Gandhi and Nehru*, Bombay, 1959.

Jawaharlal Nehru Souvenir Volumes Committee : *The Emerging World*, Bombay, 1965.

Karanja, R.K. : *The Philosophy of Mr. Nehru*, London, 1966.

Khan, Abdul Majid : *Jawaharlal Nehru and His Ideas*, New Delhi, 1951.

Kulkarni, V.B. : *The Indian Triumvirate*, Bombay, 1969.

Mookerjee, Girija K. : *Nehru : The Humanist*, New Delhi, 1972.

Moraes, Frank : *Jawaharlal Nehru : A Biography*, New York, 1950.

Moraes, Frank : *Nehru, Sunlight and Shadow*, Bombay, 1964.

Mullick, B.N. : *My Years With Nehru.*

Nanda, B.R. : *The Nehrus : Motilal and Jawaharlal.*

Neeraj (Miss) : *Nehru and Democracy in India*, Delhi, 1972.

Nehru, Jawaharlal : *Glimpses of World History.*

Nehru, Jawaharlal : *The Discovery of India*, Calcutta, 1946.

Nehru, Jawaharlal : *The Unity of India*, London, 1941.

Nehrn, Jawaharlal : *Towards Freedom.*

Nehru, Jawaharlal : *Independence and After*, New York, 1950.

Nehru, Jawaharlal : *India and the World*, London, 1936.

Nehru, Jawaharlal : *Whither India*, Allahabad, 1933.

Paul, F. Power (Ed.) : *The Meanings of Gandhi.*

Radhakrishnan, S. : *On Nehru*, Publications Division, Government of India, 1966.

Ram Gopal : *Trials of Jawaharlal Nehru*, Bombay, 1962.

Rao, V.K.R.V. : *The Nehru Legacy*, Bombay, 1971.

Rau, M. Chalapathi : *Jawaharlal Nehru : Life and Work*, New Delhi, 1966.

Rau, M. Chalapathi : *Gandhi and Nehru*, Allied Publishers, 1967.

Ravoof, A.A. : *Nehru : The Man*, Bombay, 1967.

Roy, M.N. : *Men I Met*, Bombay, 1968.

Shah, A.B. (Ed.) : *Jawaharlal Nehru, A Critical Tribute*, Bombay, 1965.

Shorter, Bani : *Nehru : A Voice for Mankind*, New York, 1970.

Shriman Narayan : *Memoirs : Window on Gandhi and Nehru*, Bombay, 1971.

Tyson, Geoffrey : *Nehru, The Years of Power.*

Zakaria, Rafiq (Ed.) : *A Study of Nehru*, Bombay, 1960

CHAPTER XXIII

M.N. Roy (1886-1954)

M. N. Roy was a legendary figure in his life-time. His role in the field of political philosophy and political practice occupies an important place. Whatever he thought and whatever he did, drew the attention of the serious thinkers of the country. His Radical Humanism or New Humanism is a great contribution to the history of political thought of Modern India.

M. N. Roy was born on 6 February 1886 in a small village in Bengal and his original name was Narendra Bhattacharya. He was a revolutionary from his student days. In his earlier years, he was influenced by Swami Vivekananda, Bankim Chandra Chatterji, Swami Dayanand and Ram Tirtha. At the tender age of 14, he decided to join the revolutionary movement. He took an active part in the agitation against the Partition of Bengal in 1905. He was arrested in 1907 and acquitted. He was again arrested in 1910 in connection with the Howrah Conspiracy case and again in 1911 but was discharged.

He came into very close contact with Jatin Mukherji whom he considered as his "Guru Dada and Commander-in-Chief." In 1915, he went twice to Java to receive German arms promised to be delivered to the Indian revolutionaries but failed to get them. He travelled through different countries like China, Japan and the United States under different assumed names. For some time, he was known as Father Martin. In 1916, he went to Mexico which he called "the land of my rebirth". In Mexico, he came in close contact with Borodin who was an agent of the Communist International. He learned from Borodin the theory and practice of Marxism.

Roy and Lenin

On the recommendation of Borodin, M. N. Roy was invited by Lenin to Russia to attend the Second World Congress of the Communist International held in 1920. Roy was asked to serve on the Colonial Commission of the Communist International. At a meeting of the Colonial Commission, Lenin presented a thesis on the national and colonial questions. Lenin proposed that the Communist parties must assist the bourgeois Democratic Liberation movements in the colonial countries. The draft, presented by Lenin, was criticised by Roy. Lenin was impressed and he asked Roy to present an alternative draft. In his alternative draft, Roy emphasised that in the first stage, the revolution in the colonies is not going to be a Communist Revolution. In many of the Eastern countries, it would be extremely unwise to try to solve the agrarian problem according to pure Communist principles. In the first stage, the revolution in the colonies must be carried on under a programme which will include many petty bourgeois reforms such as the division of land etc. He warned against the danger of bourgeois

democratic nationalists controlling the movement of workers and peasants. The Communist International and the Communist parties were urged to resist. It was necessary that the Communist International should determine more precisely its relations with the revolutionary movements in the colonies. The view of Roy was that while cooperation with the national bourgeois democrats in the struggle against imperialism was desirable, leadership of the revolution should not be surrendered to the bourgeoisie.

After a lot of discussion, Lenin brought to the Colonial Commission a final draft in which he incorporated the views of M. N. Roy. In his final draft, Lenin said that all Communist parties must give active support to the revolutionary liberation movements in those countries. The type of support shall be studied by the party in every country where there is one. The Communist International must be ready to establish temporary relationship and even alliance with the bourgeois democrats of the colonies and backward countries. However, it must not amalgamate with it. It must retain the independent character of the proletarian movement, even though that movement may be in the embryonic stage.

The main differences between the views of Lenin and Roy were regarding the cooperation with the national movements in the colonial countries. The cooperation with the national movements was to be conditional and temporary. The differences in this connection were more on emphasis and not basic and fundamental. Another difference was that Roy insisted that revolutions in Asia were more important than those in Europe. His view was that the Communist revolutions in European countries would come after the revolutions had succeeded in the colonial countries. The reason was that one of the main sources from which European capitalism drew its strength was to be found in colonial possessions and dependencies. The break-up of the colonial empire, together with the proletarian revolution on the home country, would overthrow the capitalist system in Europe. This was the point on which there were fundamental differences. This view of Roy was heard and appreciated but not accepted by Lenin.

In 1921, M. N. Roy became the Founder Director of the Communist University of the Toilers of the East. From Russia, Roy tried to influence the Indian National Congress and also made efforts for the foundation of the Communist Party of India during the twenties. In January 1924, he was expelled from Germany. He was tried *in absentia* in the Kanpur Conspiracy case in India. In June 1924 he was elected a full member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International and its Presidium. In 1927, he was sent to China as the head of a delegation to advise the Communist Party of China but his mission failed. In 1928, he was expelled from the Communist Party. He reached Bombay in December 1930 under the name of Mr. Mahmud. He attended the Karachi Session of the Congress in March 1931. He was arrested, tried and sentenced to 12 years' imprisonment which was reduced to 6 years on appeal. After his release in 1936, he joined the Indian National Congress and became a member of the All India Congress Committee. On account of his criticism of Mahatma Gandhi, he could not make any headway in the Congress. In 1939, he organised the League of Radical Congressmen. In 1940, he founded the Radical Democratic Party. He took an active interest in supporting the Allies against the Fascist Powers. He started the Indian Federation of Labour with a view to organising the

labour force of the country. In 1946, he started the Indian Renaissance Institute, Dehra Dun. In 1948, the Radical Democratic Party was dissolved. He died on 25 January 1954.

His Books

M. N. Roy was a great writer and it seems desirable to refer to some of his books and the views expressed in them. "India in Transition" was published in 1922. In this book, Roy condemned the contemporary schools of political thought in India. His view was that Indian nationalism was fundamentally a bourgeois movement. According to him, the Extremists like Tilak had a perverted socio-political philosophy. They were not extremists in fact but revivalists or reactionaries in character. He criticised the Gandhian school of thought. According to him, Gandhiji was a bundle of contradictions. He believed that the bourgeois nationalism in India will end in a compromise with imperialism and the work on revolution of India would be left to the movement of workers and peasants.

"One Year of Non-Cooperation" was published in 1923. According to Roy, the constructive contributions of Gandhism to the nationalist movement were the use of mass action for the enforcement of political demands, the building up of a nation-wide organisation such as the Congress party, the liberation of the national forces from Governmental repression by the slogan of non-violence and the adoption of Non-Cooperation and Civil Disobedience. He also summarised the fallacies and failures of Gandhism. The chief defect of Gandhism was the lack of an economic programme for the masses. Other defects were the futile effort to unite the different classes of Indian population into one popular movement and the injection of religion and metaphysics into politics. To quote Roy, "Gandhism is not revolutionism but a weak and watery reformism which shrinks at every turn from the realities of the struggle for freedom".

Roy wrote "The Future of Indian Politics"' in 1926. There was a change of his views on class structure and class relationship in Indian society. In 1928, Roy prepared a draft resolution on the Indian question which has come to be known as the *theory of decolonisation*. His view was that during the period from 1880 to 1913, Britain was exporting her capital in India. During the First World War, there was a crisis of capitalism and imperialism and as a result of that crisis the capitalist countries had to change their strategy towards the colonial countries. It was realised that the feudal economy of India could no longer give good profits to the British capitalist as it did during the earlier stage. Colonial possession represented labour. If more labour could be employed in more fruitful process of production, the colonial exploitation would be more profitable. Land as a means of production was exhausted. The interests of imperialism in crisis and capitalism in decay necessitated the introduction of other means of production than land in the colonial countries. That was the process of decolonisation. The British Empire was compelled in its own interest to follow the policy of introduction of industrialisation in India. It was during the First World War that the Industrialisation Commission for India was appointed. Industrialisation of India was the policy of the British Empire after the First World War and this was done by the imperialists in their own interest. Roy speculated that the industrialisation of

India would mean that Indian capitalists would come into being and British Imperialists would be compelled to transfer power to Indian capitalists in times to come. The theory of de-colonisation was not accepted by the leadership of the Communist International.

"Revolution and Counter-Revolution in China" was written in 1930. "Materialism" was written in 1934 and published in 1940. In "Reason, Romanticism and Revolution", Roy expressed the view that the philosophy of Marx was only a continuation of the past philosophies. His materialism was both dogmatic and unscientific. The other works by Roy were Radical Humanism, New Humanism, Politics, Power and Parties, Scientific Politics, Science and Philosophy. The Philosophical Consequences of Modern Science, Freedom or Fascism and Gandhism, Nationalism and Socialism.

Roy and Marxism

Roy was primarily a revolutionary and he became a Communist out of necessity. He was not very much attached towards Communism in the beginning. He became a Communist during his stay in Mexico as a result of his close contact with Borodin. The first impact of Marxism on him was not proletarian but nationalistic. However, Communism was anti-imperialistic and that appealed to him. He found a source of solace and inspiration which continued for 24 years of his life. He visualised that national independence was not enough and could not cure the evils of any country. To emancipate any nation, there should be a social revolution. Mere political and national revolutions were not enough. The basic principles of Marxian philosophy provided for the liberation of the human spirit. Roy found in Marxism a broader horizon in which he could merge himself and find the needed inspiration. Marxism was broad enough to accommodate the divergent ideas of Roy. Marx was a supporter of freedom and that appealed to Roy. Roy believed, as Marx had done before, in the essential goodness of man. It was common to both of them that man would be ultimately rational and free himself from irrational forces.

In the beginning, Roy accepted Marxism almost as a religion. As a Marxist, he had a firm and unwavering faith in materialism. He believed that it was the only sound philosophy. Materialism represents the knowledge of nature as it really exists. Materialism is not what it is generally supposed to be. It is not the cult of eat, drink and be merry. According to the materialists, there is nothing but matter. The origin of everything that really exists is matter. All other appearances are transformations of matter and those transformations are governed by the laws inherent in nature.

Roy considered Diderot as the leading materialist of history. He was the personification of the Age of Enlightenment. Roy described Diderot as "the man of fire and genius". Diderot did not accept materialism against his will. As a matter of fact, materialism was the spirit of the age and Diderot was the representative spokesman. He inspired an intellectual and social movement which swept the whole of Europe. He made materialism a human philosophy. Roy owed a good deal to Hobbes, Hegel, Marx and Engels for their contributions to the theory and philosophy of materialism.

In the theory of materialism of Roy, there were delicate human feelings. There was nothing like selfish motivations to attain personal gain. Roy ad-

mitted that materialism was crystallised out of a background of intellectual ferment, emotional exuberance, moral indignation, political disaffection, economic chaos and social discontent. Created by man on the basis of col lective human experience, materialism was a human philosophy which took all the aspects of human existence into consideration and attached equal importance to every manifestation of human spirit and every form of man's creativeness. To Roy, materialism was a philosophy which regarded nature as primary matter independently real and mind developed out of it.

Material objects are essential to develop human life. In order to develop human life and personality, individuals require certain elementary things. An individual must have his physical existence ensured. That can be done by any forces other than physical. Man needs food and shelter and in the life of individuals and communities, the absence of such objectives has put human existence in difficulty and sometimes destroyed it. Roy wanted to distinguish his concept of materialism from the classical concept of materialism by using the phrase "Physical Realism".

According to Roy, the world is not a product of any supernatural divine element. Material world is an objective reality. Nature is self-contained. There is nothing transcendental in this world. The world is composed of material particles that persist through all times. All the things of this world are composed of these particles.

Roy did not believe that the world had a beginning or an end. The world is eternal. The picture presented by the physical science did not contain any indication that the world ever had a beginning or will ever have an end. In the long run, life may be breathed in the frozen bodies. The discoveries of modern science have completed the picture of a self-contained and self-operative physical universe.

According to Roy, there is no contradiction between matter and life. Life emerged from the matter. Life is nothing more than a physical phenomenon. All appearance of life can be traced back to physical and chemical causes. Roy rejects intuition, eternal truths, self-evident synthetic propositions and *a priori* first principles as the basis of knowledge. Experience is the foundation of knowledge. It is not purely an empirical process. It is selective, interpretative, systematic, coordinative, logically coherent explanation of perceptual facts.

Roy approved of the materialism advocated by Marx. The post-Marxian developments in the natural sciences did not *"dematerialise"* the matter. As a matter of fact, they yielded more secrets to the knowledge of man. They vindicated materialism, having provided it with an unshakeable foundation of positive knowledge. As a method of approach to existence as a whole, materialism ensures knowledge of truth about life progressively but surely. As it is a powerful instrument of change, materialism appeals to those classes and sections in society which have no stake in the established social order.

Although Roy abandoned orthodox Marxism in his later life, he did not give up his faith in materialism. The only deficiency which he found in the materialism of Marx was that it did not carry the analysis of mental phenomenon far enough beyond the dawn of social history.

Upto 1940 Roy adhered to the philosophy of Marx wholeheartedly. His differences with Lenin, the Communist International and the Communist Party of India were all matters of tactics or policies and not of ideology. He seemed to be concerned with the application of the Marxian principles to the existing structure. However, after 1940 Roy started re-thinking about Marxism and came to differ from Marxism in certain respects. He differed from Marx on the attack over surplus value. The view of Roy was that Marx being a penetrating student of economic history could not dispute the necessity and progressive social significance of surplus production. "Economically demand for the abolition of surplus value will be impracticable, indeed suicidal. Social surplus value will disappear if production of surplus value is ever stopped; then, with the disappearance of the lever of progress, society will stagnate and eventually break down."

Marx had thought that surplus value was the cause of social injustice and de-generation. The view of Roy was that the surplus value was the only lever for further social progress and cultural development and ancient civilisations disappeared owing to inadequacy or shrinkage of social surplus.

Marx put emphasis on economic aspect of life and progress. He was indifferent towards the humanitarian, utopian and reformist aspects of the classical economy. The view of Roy was that that approach was not adequate. Along with economic consideration, there are social and ideological considerations whose importance cannot be ignored in the study of development of history.

Marx left very little role for the individuals as the course of history was pre-determined by the economic laws of demand and supply fixed in course of time without any effective impact by the individual. Roy did not accept that view. According to him, human society is determined, but there is not one sole determining factor. The role of ideas, beliefs, aspirations and a number of other considerations cannot be ignored. Anthropological research does not show any economic motive in the human struggle for existence in the earlier stages of social evolution. The view of Roy was that the growth of Marxism had clouded the intellectual climate of the present world and aggravated the crisis of our times. Marxism left man with a double life—real servitude and imaginary freedom.

Roy did not like the Marxian idea of merging the individual in the society. He placed the individual above everything else. He refused to accept the individual as a means to an end which was the state and the society. His view was that society is there to enable "the human being to conduct the struggle for existence with greater efficiency." He differed from Marx and emphasised the moral, intellectual and social freedom that makes man the maker of his destiny and realise his potential ability and express himelf in a rational way. He declared that the individual to be free must not only be able to enjoy economic freedom and security but also must live in a social and psychologically conducive atmosphere, free from all kinds of cultural and intellectual regimentation. He considered human freedom as a basic factor. The view of Roy was that Marx made a deliberate attempt to enslave the individual. His own view was that the community grew as an organisation to serve the interests of the individuals. Marx made the community primary and the individual secondary. Roy considered that as a mistake.

The view of Roy was that Marx was prejudiced and he was determined to offer judgement even without considering the main issues. He was not prepared to follow blindly the Marxian way. Marx had said that Communism was the last stage in political evolution. The contention of Roy was that if that was so, humanity must commit suicide. The reason given by him was that if mankind does not progress any more, if there is to be no further room for social evolution, then there is stagnation and life must disintegrate.

The view of Roy was that the idea of economic determinism as given by Marx is not adequate. Economic determinism would lead to the dangerous notion of ethical relativism.

Roy also disagreed with the Marxian idea of the dominant role of the means of production. He pointed out that the most powerful means of production is the brain. Roy believed that economic determinism was not a corollary to materialism or humanism. The subordination of man to the impersonal forces would make him a means of production rather than a free producer.

Roy was also critical of the Marxian principle of class struggle. He admitted the existence of classes with diverse interests but argued that it is equally true that the cohesive forces are also inherent in society. The centrifugal tendency is counteracted by the centripetal tendency. In the history of social evolution, an equilibrium between the two created stability whereas discord and disharmony led either to the establishment of dictatorship or other autocratic forms of government or to social disintegration. If there were no cohesive force in society, mankind would have continued in a state governed by the law of the jungle. The entire history of society shows that the cohesive force has always been more or less in operation, otherwise there could be no history of civilisation. Ancient civilisation broke down because the forces of social cohesion and harmony were overwhelmed by strong centrifugal tendencies.

Roy considered the idea of withering away of the state as given by Marx as absurd. The state would never disappear unless human society reverted to the state of savagery.

Roy described Marx as a false prophet who predicted disappearance of the middle class. The expansion of the economic process has led to the increase in the number of middle class. The middle class constituted the cultural and political leadership in post-1919 world history. It produced revolutionaries.

Roy denounced the theory of dictatorship of the proletariat. In fact, he laid emphasis on the individual more than the class whether it be the working class or the middle class. His view was that the conflict of the present age was between totalitarianism and democracy, between the all-devouring collective ego-nation or class and the individual struggling for freedom. He in fact gave a pride of place to the middle class rather than the proletariat.

Roy criticised Marxian emphasis on revolution. His view was that the dictatorship of the proletariat and the concept of revolution was apt to lead to totalitarianism. In his opinion, revolutions could not bring miracles. However, he did not discard revolutions altogether. As a radical humanist, he

believed that a revolution should be brought about not through class struggle or armed violence but through education which included all modes of persuasion of the masses. His view was that there is an element of voluntary romanticism in revolutions. Revolutions represent collective emotions heightened to a pitch and in fact exaltation of human efforts to remake the world.

In spite of the differences, it must be remembered that Roy was a serious student of Marxism and had real appreciation for it. To quote him, "Marxism revolutionises philosophy itself. It sets new task to philosophy. Previously philosophy had simply tried to explain the world but in future it must point out the way to reconstruct it." Roy believed with full confidence that Marxism was a practical philosophy which could be used as a means to create a set of conditions and ideas which could open a new vista of vision for building a rational society. He admired Marxism to such an extent that he was prepared to place it independent of time. He had an open mind towards Marxism. He took special interest to save Marxism from grooves. To him, Marxism was not a closed system of philosophy but a way of thinking. He opposed the idea of making Marxism a religion. Marxism was a scientific philosophy. It could not be dogmatic. Roy based his understanding of Marxism on reason and critical thinking. He was prepared to refute and go beyond Marxism if the conditions and circumstances so required. His view was that Marxism could not be the horoscope of humanity. It was only a method to study and interpret history. Roy wanted to meet Marx half-way in his interpretation above the relationship between the individual and the community. He felt that the community grew as an organisation to secure the best and positive interests of the individuals.

Humanism

Humanism is derived from the Latin word 'Humanus' which means a system of thought concerned with human affairs in general. Humanism is an attitude which attaches primary importance to man and his faculties, affairs and aspirations. Humanism had to pass through a process of development and change but its main idea was that man must remain the supreme being. Schiller suppotred the idea that man is the measure of all things. To the majority of Humanist thinkers, Humanism simply meant a study of man. From that attitude, humanism could be defined as an attitude of mind which gave primary importance to man and his faculties. Man was the centre of consideration in all walks of life. Humanism was not confined to Europe alone and had its impact also in Asian countries. New ideas and beliefs developed in humanism during the nineteenth century. One important idea was that man must be sovereign and there should be no dogmatic authority over the life and thought of man. There were fast changes in humanist philosophy in the 20th century. It took different lines—pragmatism, existentialism and Marxism

The modern Humanists believe that Humanism can mean two things. It may mean that man is the supreme value and an end by himself. Another meaning is that man is all the time outside himself. It is in projecting himself and losing himself, beyond himself that he makes man to exist. As man is self-surpassing, he is himself the heart and centre of transcendence. There is no other universe except the human universe. The real problem for man

is not to seek God but to seek himself again and again to understand that nothing can save him from himself.

The humanists assert that man by nature is good and capable of indefinite advances towards perfection. There exists no insuperable barrier to future progress of human civilisation. Man must be able to realise the heaven of comfort and happiness here in this physical world.

New Humanism

Roy gave his philosophy of New Humanism as he found many defects in the existing Humanism. His ideas changed between 1947 and 1954. In August 1947, he expounded his political views in a Manifesto. The view of Roy was that unless chains of religion and superstition were broken, there was no chance for real humanism. Religion of any type, with God or without God, was against the very spirit of humanism. Religion represents an attitude of surrender which is undesirable for a happy growth of humanism. Each and every religion by necessity must assume some super-human existence. Humanism which primarily assumes and emphasises the primacy of man cannot be based on the notion that there is something or someone higher than man himself. Humanism must be an ethical philosophy. It must insist that man alone is responsible for what he is. Human values in the last analysis must be human. They must be the creation of man and must grow out of his needs and interests and must be sustained by his ideals and ends. Humanism must keep pace with the growth of man, his knowledge about nature and himself. It must keep pace with the aspirations and ideals of the ordinary man. It cannot be confined within the narrow circle of supermen or demi-gods.

The New Humanism of Roy took the shape of new politico-philosophical movement. New Humanism tries to go into the genesis of man and to examine the background out of which man emerges in nature. The study of science establishes that there is nothing extra-natural in man. Nowhere in its evolution does anything extraneous to his own nature enter into this process. Whatever we call human nature, man's attributes and potentialities can be strictly deduced from the background of the evolving physical universe.

New Humanism of Roy is based on the fundamental experiences of life. It is a bold adventure in the realm of intellect, ideas and experience. The mystery of man has been solved by modern sciences, particularly by modern methods of biology. Man is the outcome of biological evolution. In order to find the sanction of morality in man himself, the roots of what is known as conscious or moral sense must be traced in mechanistic biological functions articulated by instincts and institutions. Roy emphasised the fact that biological evolution takes place in the context of the physical universe. Its mechanism is a part of the cosmic mechanism. Life grows out of the background of inanimate matter. The descent of man can be traced to the law-governed physical universe. It is in the nature of man as a biological organism to be rational and moral. Man is capable of living with others in peace and harmony.

New Humanism deduces all values from the supreme value of freedom. Freedom is the supreme value of life because the urge for freedom is the

essence of human existence. It can be traced all the way down the entire process of biological evolution. As all ethical values are derived from the biological heritage of man, they require no sanction which transcends human existence. To be moral, what is required is to be human. It is not necessary to go in search of divine or mystic metaphysical sanction. Humanist morality is revolutionary.

The struggle of man for survival is eternal. His urge for freedom is also eternal. He may not be always conscious of it but it is a basic incentive for him to acquire knowledge and conquer environments, by knowing them. In course of struggle for freedom, man discovers truth. It is not a metaphysical or an abstract thing. It is the content of man's knowledge. It is a fact which is objectively real.

In the past, humanism proclaimed the sovereignty of man, but man remained unexplained and speculation about the essence of man led to mysticism and revival of religion. Thus, humanism defeated itself. As a result of modern scientific knowledge, humanism can be freed from all fallacies.

New Humanism proclaims the sovereignty of man on the authority of modern science. It maintains that a rational and moral society is possible because man, by nature, is rational and therefore can be moral, not under any compulsion but voluntarily. The sanction of morality is embedded in human nature.

New Humanism is a social philosophy. It is deduced from a general philosophy of nature. Its metaphysics is physical. The cosmology is mechanistic. It merges psychology into physiology. It bases ethics on rationalism.

New Humanism reconciles the romantic doctrine of revolution that man makes history, with the rationalist notion of orderly social progress. History is not a chaotic conglomeration of fortuitous events. Social evolution is a determined process. New Humanism rejects economic determinism. Man's will is the motive force of social evolution. It is the most powerful determining factor of history. Human will and ideas cannot be referred directly to economic incentives.

According to New Humanism, revolutions must go beyond an economic reorganisation of society in order to create a new world of liberty and social justice. The urge for freedom is the basic incentive for life. The purpose of all rational human endeavour must be to remove all those social conditions which stand in the way of the development of man. The position of man is the indicator of the progressive and liberating significance of any collective effort or social system.

New Humanism emphasises the fact that man is the maker of his world. Man is a thinking animal. Revolutions are the result of ideas conceived by gifted individuals. Education of the citizens is the condition of a reorganisation of society. It is conducive to common progress and prosperity without encroaching on the freedom of the individual.

New Humanism is cosmopolitan. A cosmopolitan commonwealth of spiritually free men is not to be limited by the boundaries of national states which will gradually disappear under the impact of the twentieth century Renaissance of man.

The critics of New Humanism maintain that it is a kind of Utopia, but it is pointed out that those critics do not understand the practical side of the new philosophy. M. N. Roy himself had said, "New Humanism is not an abstract philosophy, nor merely a social philosophy or a political or economic theory. It is a set of principles which have relevance to all branches of man's life and social existence and show a way towards their recognition". The principles of New Humanism were intended to inspire man to reach higher ideals and higher position in life. They were intended to teach men to take things in their own hands and shape their own destiny. New Humanism was intended to meet the new challenge.

New Humanism is not essentially new. It is nothing but the old doctrine of human sovereignty and dignity informed by modern science. It tries to coordinate the knowledge and experience acquired in the different departments of science. It is also called Internal Humanism. It is also called Radical Humanism because it tries to explain the problem from the roots. M. N. Roy made new Humanism a flexible philosophical structure. New Humanism could not be a closed system. It was based on the experience of mankind and had to grow and evolve with the growth and development of human knowledge.

New Humanism and Marxism

There is a lot of similarity between Marxism and New Humanism. When Marx wrote, the knowledge about the scientific world was not so perfect as it is today. In his time, biology and psychology were in an infant stage of development. Hence the philosophy of Marx could not be applied to a later period when new ideas dominate the field of biology and psychology. M. N. Roy tried to re-build humanism in the background of this experience and knowledge. Hence it is said that New Humanism is Marxism revised in the light of modern knowledge and experience.

There are certain basic differences between Marxism and New Humanism. Unlike Marxism, the individual is given the top-most place in New Humanism. The human-being is taken not only in the context of society but of the whole universe. Marx had said that a good society is necessary to have good individuals. Roy asserted that it is important to have good individuals first to have a good society.

New Humanism pleaded for a scientific outlook and maintained that there can be rational understanding and harmony in the life of individuals and social organisations through knowledge, education and a spirit of co-operative living.

New Humanism emerges as a philosophy of the modern man without any bondage. Whether New Humanism can stand the test of time or not, it is difficult to say. However, one thing is certain that the contribution of M. N. Roy to political philosophy through New Humanism is immense.

Even if it is argued that the doctrine of Radical Humanism is just a restatement of the legacy of the Renaissance, it is no small service to the cause of humanism. The challenges that face the legacy of the Renaissance are new and unprecedented. It goes to the credit of Roy that he discovered the present day relevance of the values of the Renaissance and sought an answer to the problems of contemporary society by re-emphasising those values. The view of Roy that rational man makes rational society is plausible.

The point is that if man is rational and reason is inherent in human nature, what makes his behaviour irrational or why he fails to act accordingly. Roy was aware of this dilemma. He believes that owing to long dis-use because traditions and social institutions never appealed to reason and rationalism, the people tended to forget that they are thinking beings. Roy also said that the rational nature of man has been buried fathoms deep. What is important is his passionate and persistent attack on traditions and social institutions.

The State

In the earlier part of his career, Roy was influenced by the Marxian interpretation of the state. There was also the influence of Lenin on him. Till November 1936, Roy supported the main trend of Marxian ideology so far as the role of the state was concerned. After 1936, there was a change in his outlook. That was due to his realisation that the Marxist idea subordinated the individual to the state. Actually, the state could not be an end by itself. It was a means to attain the welfare of the individuals who constituted the society. Roy disagreed with the Marxist view that the state would wither away. According to him, the state is a necessary evil. For the sake of good Government, there should be the state. However, the powers and functions of the state should be well-defined. Roy accepted the Liberal view that the state is an instrument to attain common interests. He was opposed to all kinds of regimentation and dictatorship in the name of the state. His experience with the working of dictatorship was not a happy one and he began to feel that the state should be built on democratic foundations. As the state is a political organisation of society, the people should have complete control over the affairs of the state.

Roy wanted to establish a Radical Democratic state which would eliminate the inadequacies of parliamentary democracy and also provide against the danger of dictatorship of any class or the elite. He wanted to reconcile economic planning with individual freedom. He also stood for the largest measure of direct democracy.

The view of Roy was that every institution, including the state, is created by the individuals for their benefit. The greatest problem of the modern state is that the state should not be allowed to swallow its creator. All men are born equal. There are no supermen who are born to rule and no inferior men who are born to be ruled as Plato and Aristotle suggested. As society is the very beginning of human species, the state is neither conventional nor artificial but natural.

In the very beginning when human species came into existence, there was no society, no state and no organisation. The human species started their struggle as individuals. In course of time, the isolated individuals realised that together they could carry on the struggle more successfully and that was the origin of society. As society and state are the creation of man, they cannot claim sovereignty over individuals. Roy limits the sovereignty of state by individual freedom as freedom is an end and society and state are created by individuals to attain that end.

The view of Roy was the state is only a means for securing individual freedom. He supported the theory of Locke under which the sovereign individual was not submerged in the state. The individual remained the end and

the state a means. The state is created to secure individual freedom and it must confine itself within the sovereignty of the individual.

Roy was not in favour of giving too many functions to the state as those were likely to stand in the way of the growth of the individual. Man has a manifold personality and that cannot be covered by a single institution called the state, howsoever important it may be. The individual seeks to realise his freedom through a variety of other institutions. The state should give way as much as possible to voluntary associations. If too many functions are given to the state, there is centralisation of powers which encroaches upon the freedom of the individual. The state must not go beyond its limits. Certain matters which are strictly personal, matters like cultural, moral, educational and even economic are completely outside the jurisdiction of the state. The state should not regulate education because state education is an instrument of exploiting the people by the party in power. The state should not undertake the task of educating the people as it may educate them into slavery. The state must not take economic planning in its hands because under planning the Government assumes control over the means of production, distribution and exchange and exercises a number of economic controls which must result in the loss of individual liberty. State interference will dry up the springs of voluntary action. In economic affairs, the state is to be given the right to manage public finance and administer fiscal and monetary policies. It has nothing to do with economic security, controlling or owning production, distribution and exchange.

Roy was opposed to any sort of interference in the name of a welfare state. His contention was that in a welfare state, the welfare of the individual is purchased at the cost of individual freedom which is more important than welfare.

Political Parties

Roy was a great critic of the party system. His view was that on account of the political parties, politics has become a scramble for power. Parties do not appeal to the reason of the individuals but to the sentiments of the masses. The concept of the accountability of the representatives to the people has become a sham. For all practical purposes, they are responsible to the party to which they belong. That creates "a state of political instability and growing threat of the breakdown of state machinery, a weakening of public morality and insecurity of state". Hence, Roy concluded that "party politics implies the denial of democracy; it implies that people cannot do anything by themselves. It is a denial of the political intelligence and creativity of all men, of the sovereignty of the people". Party Government represents the rule of the minority as the membership of even the largest party is only a small fraction of the people.

Democracy

The view of Roy was that democracy is the best of all the forms of government. However, he was not a blind admirer of democracy. He made a critical study and analysis of the problems associated with the working of democratic institutions. He accepted democracy as an escape from totalitarianism. For him, democracy was essentially anti-totalitarian. His love for demo-

cracy was a part of his faith in humanism and the essential goodness of man. He was influenced by the French Revolutionaries. He admired Robespiere who had strong faith in the ordinary man.

Roy understood the problems arising in different countries in the name of establishing democratic governments. He felt that on many occasions, political leaders gave slogans of democracy to mislead the masses. Any attempt to dogmatise the minds of the people was anti-democratic. Democracy must offer absolute freedom of mind and intellect. Roy pointed out that on many occasions, democracy was betrayed by its own advocates. The commonest cause for the fall of democracy was the lack of vigilance on the part of the people. Roy explained to the people the importance of their role to save democracy. He pointed out that democracy is not a machinery which works automatically. It requires constant attention and interest without which democracy dies out slowly.

Roy connected democracy with humanism. According to him, the two were noble dreams of mankind. Both democracy and humanism must rise and fall together. The rise of one is an essential condition for the rise of the other and the decline of one leads to the decline of the other. Democracy is the social and institutional expression of the philosophy of humanism. Humanism entails confidence in man and democracy is born out of that confidence.

Roy emphasised the fact that freedom of man and unrestricted popular sovereignty should be the main purpose of any government. The liberation of man is possible only in a free atmosphere of real democracy.

The love of Roy for democracy is proved by the fact that during the Second World War, Roy and his co-workers openly supported the British Government against Germany and Japan. The reason given by him was that the Fascist Powers were determined to destroy democracy and hence they must be destroyed at any cost.

Radical Democracy

The view of M. N. Roy was that there was a decline in the spirit of democracy in the world. Liberalism created a situation in which unscrupulous demagogues and power-hungry politicians came to wield enormous power by inciting mass violence. Liberalism in practice reduced political activity to a scramble for power. That led to several consequences. It repelled the more detached and enlightened members of society from participation in political life. It created an atmosphere in which the 'demos' developed a lust for power without any sense of responsibility or desire for creative work through the state. The formalisation of democracy marked a beginning of the process of its own dissolution.

To escape from the difficult situation and criticism of democracy, M. N. Roy suggested the formation of Radical Democracy or Organised Democracy. Radical democracy was a solution between chaos and dictatorship. The experience of the two World Wars and the realisation after them, created a mental strain in mankind. Man became nervous about his future. The view of M. N. Roy was that there was no reason to beliece that man will not be able to overcome the catastrophe and continue his endeavour for a rational and free society. That was possible under Radical Democracy.

The Radical Democrats try to redefine the concept of democracy. According to them, the concept of "rule of the people" could be understood in different ways. If the "rule of the people" means nothing but participation of every valid voter in the political election, then there will be many anti-democratic countries which must be classified as democracy. The mere right to vote should not be the test of a democracy as such a test may lead to dangerous conclusions. The right to vote without corresponding obligations would make the voter irresponsible towards the political life of the country. Without a real interest, democracy would degenerate into a state of the rich and the poor, each clashing against the other.

In Radical Democracy, the emphasis is not put on the right of voting. It is aimed to raise the people to a higher standard of existence. Radical democrats criticise parliamentary democracy as a pretence to rule over the people. It is not a government for the good of the people. There is so much difference between the rulers and the ruled that it is difficult to find much common interest between the two. Radical Democracy is intended to save not only the political situation but also the civilisation itself. Radical democracy should not be taken as a Utopia. It aims at increasing production, meeting the demands of the people and creating a higher standard of living in general. Radical democracy aims at fulfilling the interests of an overwhelming majority of the people.

Radical Democrats want to extend democracy from the formal political to the essential economic field. The privileges and material gains of power are to be shared by all. Radical democracy does not give any special position or attention to any particular class or group. It is intended to be one of the daring experiments of the twentieth century democratic civilisation. Every human-being is to be as educated and cultured and high-minded as a philosopher and as free, rich and mighty as kings of the past.

The unit of organised democracy will be the people's committees. These committees will be the organs of direct democracy. The sovereign democratic power will be expressed through local people's committees in villages, towns and cities. They will be elected every year by all the men and women of respective localities who have attained the age of 18 years. The number of members of the people's committees will be one-fourth of the total number of voters in the locality. The functions of the people's committees will be the following :—

1. To nominate candidates to seek election to the Federal Assembly and the Provincial Peoples' Councils.

2. To give constant expression to the will of the people for the guidance of their representatives in the Federal Assembly and the respective Provincial Peoples' Councils.

3. To discuss and express opinion on proposed legislations by the Federal Assembly and the representative Provincial People's Council.

4. To recommend the recall of the representatives of the particular constituency, either in the Federal Assembly or in the representative Provincial Peoples' Council, on the ground that the representative has failed to act according to the mandate of his constituents.

5. To recommend the recall of the Governor-General and/or of the respective Provincial Governor.

6. To initiate legislation by the Federal Assembly or the representative Provincial Peoples' Council.

7. To demand a referendum on any legislative or executive measure either on the Federal or representative Provincial government.

Every citizen is to be informed and consulted in the functioning of the government. This is possible if power goes to the people's committees and not to the party. Education of the people will be a key factor in the successful conduct of democracy. Roy suggested the selection of "men of science, intelligence, integrity, wisdom and moral excellence" for the second chamber of the Federal Assembly. It would be given the power of planning and development of society in all branches—economic, health, education and society.

It is difficult to put into practice all the aspects of Radical democracy but the idea of Radical democracy was an important one and it deserved serious attention at a time when democracy was being strangled in many countries. Roy's ideal of Radical democracy is not just a government for the people. The individual must take an active part. Only then there can be a government of the people, by the people and for the people. It involves an idea of direct democracy but in modern times direct democracy cannot be put into practice. Roy claims that humanist practice of democracy suggests ways and means for the practice of direct democracy under modern conditions. Roy has given a true picture of the government machinery in his book "New Humanism" published in 1953. Radical democracy will enable every individual to exercise his sovereign right in the actual sense. People's committees will create conditions that will stimulate among the people the urge for freedom, the desire to rely on themselves and to be makers of their own destiny and the spirit of free thinking. The individual will never submit to any external authority by exchanging his freedom for the security of slaves. A new Renaissance based on rationalism, individualism and cosmopolitan humanism is essential for democracy to be realised and capable of defending itself.

Cooperative Economy

The view of Roy is that the philosophies of capitalism, socialism, communism, welfare state etc. are wrong and cannot guarantee democracy, freedom and security. The only alternative is cooperative economy. It embraces an integrated view of human nature based on freedom, rationality and morality. It can avoid exploitation and is consistent with the liberty and security of the individual. The relationship between a cooperative society and its members is not that of the principal and the agent. It is a part of the individual enterprise of its members. It is an association of human beings. A cooperative society is not an economic entity which pursues its own independent economic career separate from its members. As a matter of fact, the members are the society.

Cooperative economy neither snatches freedom nor security. It is antithetical to planning because cooperative economy involves considerable economic planning. The very act of forming a cooperative and agreeing to obey its rules constitutes the beginning of economic order. The cooperative movement by its very nature is a means of substituting concerted action for scattered individual action.

M. N. Roy does not give a neutral or secondary role to the cooperative. He emphasises its positive role as distinct from the capitalist or socialist economy. He asserts that cooperation should be regarded as a distinct alternative. It is a movement neither auxiliary to capitalism nor a component of socialism, but signifies an independent and higher construction than both.

The working population of a village can form itself into a cooperative community for all the three purposes of estate management, farming operations and the running of village industries. Building up a cooperative economic system from the bottom upwards will help the solution of the problem of organising and running a democratic economic system. Cooperative ownership of the means of production and management will prevent centralisation of economic power and exploitation of man by man where economic needs do not permit private ownership. Cooperative organisation of economic activities will enable every primary producer or consumer to have a direct interest in the conduct of economic activities. Consequently, it will be possible to raise economic efficiency without sacrificing the human factor.

Over these multi-purpose cooperatives at the base, there shall be a pyramidal structure at the district, regional, provincial and national level. All the economic activity shall be carried on by these cooperatives. The state will administer only public finance. It will also render financial help in accordance with the plans of regional cooperatives for schemes involving the interests of large areas. It will interfere in economic matters only if a demand is made from the bottom for such interference.

Democratic Planning

M. N. Roy was an advocate of democracy in the political sphere as well as in the economic sphere. The economic life of a community must be based on democratic principles. Democratic planning is planning not only for the people but also planning by the people, within the shortest period, without neglecting freedom. In this respect, individual dignity will certainly suffer if planning is done only for the people and not by the people. Both economic betterment and individual liberty are essential for the wholesome manifestation of the personality of man. Both must be achieved but not at the cost of each other. On the altar of economic betterment, individual dignity and freedom must not be sacrificed. Planning should take place on such lines as individuals can take active part in, and not become passive spectators for whom regimentation is proposed in the name of economic planning. "Freedom, democracy and regard for individual dignity are possible only if the planning is by the people, from the bottom upwards."

The ideal of democratic planning has three aims. Production should be done not for profit but for use. There should be a decentralised economy, territorial and functional. There should be popular initiative in place of state coercion. These aims cannot be attained under capitalism or through nationalisation and collectivisation. Nazism, Socialism, Communism, welfare state and mixed economy are all to be rejected as they are not able to carry out planning in a democratic way. The very basis of democratic planning is de-centralisation and decentralised economy requires territorial and functional autonomy. What is required is vesting of original jurisdiction in plan-

ning with bodies where individuals can take decisions in their own right and not merely in a representative capacity. Primary planning must be undertaken in local territorial units and the task at the top is to be restricted to lying down broad objectives and coordinating separate unit plans.

Democratic planning must not be rigid planning. Democratic consideration requires a small unit for the formation of planning. It must be sufficiently restricted to permit all the residents in its jurisdiction to participate actively in the formulation of the plan.

Cooperative Socialism

Roy was disapppointed by the methods of the existing types of socialism and he therefore evolved a new type of socialism called cooperative socialism. Cooperative Socialism accepted the individuals as independent units of society. There was no domination of any kind. There was nothing to compel the individual to lose any part of his freedom for any purpose. To quote M. N. Roy, "Man is freedom-loving, romantic and creative animal. He could submit to no domination, direction or bondage. So it would be the task of the Cooperative Commonwealth to give every individual the opportunities for direct participation in the governance of the state through the Panchayats."

The idea of Cooperative Socialism is based on the belief that man is a social animal and would eagerly seek cooperation as soon as he discovers from his own experience that cooperation with his neighbours in production, distribution and exchange increases his income and minimises his labour. Man will not hesitate to join a Cooperative Commonwealth because he is a gainer by joining it. The gain is not only economic but also includes other benefits. In the Cooperative Commonwealth, food will be there not because it is a price for freedom but because the individual would make an effort, along with other fellow human-beings, to get it. There is no compromising sacrifice to be made. There is no loss of individual thought in moral, cultural, intellectual, political and social sector. M. N. Roy wanted to build a super-structure of cooperative socialism with all the advantages of a liberal philosophy and benefits of organised society. His view was that cooperative socialism could be a substitute for Communism on one side and capitalism on the other. He hoped that through cooperative socialism, the present political crisis can be solved. The clash between the individual interest and the interest of the community can be averted and a rational society can be established. Cooperative socialism is not merely a method of economic attainment. In a way, it is a way of life and living.

Freedom

The whole of the life of M. N. Roy was devoted to the cause of freedom which was not confined to economic freedom alone. Freedom was a part of living rather than certain specific economic or social privileges. It was a positive concept without which any kind of cultural and civilised living was not possible. Freedom should be understood in the context of human happiness. It should be the basis of human consideration to safeguard man's happiness and promote human personality. It should be a driving force of culture and higher standard of life. Freedom should stand for a sublime, powerful and purposeful ideal.

Roy's love for freedom was unique. He founded his political philosophy on the basis of freedom. He was not satisfied with physical freedom alone. He valued intellectual freedom as one of the most desirable things for human happiness and cultural progress. He was a life-long fighter against those forces which make man mentally and intellectually a slave.

According to Roy, freedom is not a gift granted by any authority to anybody. Freedom is a thing that we have to conquer afresh in ourselves every day. The battle of freedom is never over and the field is never quite. Roy wanted every lover of freedom to be eternally careful so that the enemies of freedom may not attack him. The fellow fighters for freedom must be organised to defend their liberty.

Roy was not an advocate of absolute and unlimited liberty of the individual. According to him, the individual should not be motivated by evil objectives for personal gain only. Roy had no intention to make every one free. He was a realist of the highest order.

Roy struggled for the real emancipation of the masses which alone could make a nation free in every aspect of life. He founded his theory of freedom on practical experience and observations. For him, freedom was not mere imagination or speculation. He regarded freedom as supreme value which is the source of all human values. The urge for freedom is the essence of human existence. It is never in danger of being mystified because it can be rationally traced.

Roy asserted that economic freedom is not the only freedom but without economic freedom, much of life will be not only difficult but also impossible. It was the consideration of economic freedom that led him into the field of socialism which alone can offer economic liberty. Roy was confronted with the problem of freedom in the domain of socialism. He wanted to free himself from the Marxian orthodoxy so that he could be free to view upon the society and individual with fuller observation. The problem of the individual and the dignity of human personality were adored by him. In his book "Reason, Romanticism and Revolution", Roy developed the idea that the quest for freedom provides the basis for man's constant search for knowledge which enables hm to become progressively free from the tyranny of natural phenomena and physical and social environments. In fact, it is a continuation of the biological struggle for existence. In modern society, in order to be free, an individual must not only be able to enjoy economic sufficiency and security, but live in a psychological atmosphere free from cultural regimentation and helpful to the development of his intellectual and other human potentialities.

Roy considered freedom as a positive concept which implies balance and relation. Freedom can be taken as the surplus value in integral achievement over and above the unavoidable submissions to rule, norm and restrictions. It lies in the relation between the prerogatives of self and others. Freedom is a positive quality of human behaviour. A person who feels completely in harmony with his cultural background, should feel himself to be free. Freedom should be taken as a positive concept whatever the problems and difficulties that might be.

Freedom is the difference between the civilised and the uncivilised man. Freedom gives man the power to anticipate and to establish values by the

guidance of which man can engage himself in social and communal activities. This type of freedom embraces both legal and political aspects.

In his theory of freedom, Roy ruled out belief in anything supernatural. He rejected the possibility of any revealed wisdom or any claims of spiritualism. Religion is a product of mental weakness and not strength. Roy mercilessly criticised the system of religious preaching by great men like Ramakrishna, Vivekananda and Mahatma Gandhi. He considered all attempts to infuse religion as a primitive method of hypnosis. He considered any religion and particularly Hinduism, as an ideology of social slavery. Religion takes away the individual zeal for original thinking and fills up the gap by a fatalistic outlook. The masses will remain resigned to the miseries of life as a result of their belief in their own sins in previous births. Man's intellectual freedom and liberty to think about himself has been dried up by religious preachers and philosophers. The idea of salvation is a myth.

Man can be more free if he is more independent economically. It is impossible to think of moral and intellectual freedom without economic background. Freedom is not an accident. It is not a passing phase in the life of an individual or a nation. It should be considered as a part of civilised existence. It is not that there must be more production but there must be equal distribution also. There must be no chance of exploitation of man by man. The entire economic set-up must be so planned that the interests and liberties of the individuals are not hampered. Roy supported scientific production to increase material prosperity and to safeguard freedom through economic organisation on modern technology.

The view of Roy was that man is the primary factor in society. He is the central force with which society has to move. All freedom must be based on the individual. Social organisation and the various social relations can be harmonious, stable and rational only to the extent those relations promote the liberty and purpose of individuals. By supporting the individual against the supreme power of society, Roy recovered the individual and his freedom. Man has natural rights and those rights and liberties must be protected. Man's freedom is lost in a nightmare of institutions of various types. Social, economic, political and legal institutions have exploited much of the original freedom the individual had or should have enjoyed now.

According to Roy, knowledge is not only power but it also leads to freedom. In the earlier periods, man was in bondage socially, economically, politically and morally on account of his lack of exact knowledge. The growth of knowledge had added to the freedom of man. Freedom becomes complicated because the power to use it does not lie in properly qualified hands. The men who exercise power are ignorant of the ways in which power should be used. Roy was convinced that the methods of power must be reoriented. A people to be free must be educated. Man is free because he has no clear knowledge about himself and the conditions in which he lives. To keep the lamp of freedom burning, education must be given a top place in any culture. Mere expansion of knowledge and education is not enough. It may lead to intellectual tyranny which again may lead man to slavery. For the sake of freedom, religion should not be included in the educational curriculum.

Freedom creates useful citizens. It has great emotional potency. It is a

symbol which stands for a sublime, powerful and potential idea. Freedom is an integral part of good social living and citizenship.

Knowledge will lead in reasonable man to know his rights and liberties. That would mean revolt against those forces which deprive him of his legitimate liberties. Freedom can be the result of a revolution. Without revolution, there cannot be dynamism. A static society would create stagnation which is suicidal. To be free, one must revolt and be prepared for any price that may have to be paid.

Freedom of the individual must consist in the fullest development of all his potentialities in this world. The main purpose of all rational human endeavour is the attainment of freedom in an ever-increasing measure. Freedom is the progressive disappearance of all kinds of restrictions on the capacity of the individual to express himself to the maximum. An individual cannot be considered as merely a cog in the wheels of a mechanised society. He must fight and revolt for his freedom, whatever the consequences.

Roy preferred democracy to any other form of government as freedom is possible only in a democracy. An undemocratic government kills the individual capacity for choice and liquidates the very moral foundation of human existence.

Roy found that the state in actual practice takes away much of the individual freedom which it has no right to do. Hence, he reduced the functions of the state to the minimum, viz., to promote general welfare without any prejudice to the freedom of the individual. Man has been fighting for his freedom from the beginning of civilisation. His love for freedom is an inborn and natural instinct. Man has been fighting during the course of history to win and retain freedom. The battle for freedom is eternal as man's urge for freedom is eternal. Man's struggle for freedom is a continuation of the biological struggle for survival on a higher level. Hence, Roy defined freedom as progressive disappearance of the manifold impediments to the unfolding of the potentialities biologically inherent in man.

There is a basic difference between the approach of M. N. Roy towards freedom and that of other thinkers. Many of the earlier advocates of freedom took the problem as a political issue, but M. N. Roy considered it as a biological problem. He considered the issue as more basic and fundamental. "If man as a biological being was not possessed of infinite potentialities of development, freedom would be a vain dream, an ideal never to be realised. It can be claimed as a birth-right of man only when the struggle for it is known to be a biological heritage."

After becoming free, man must be able to enjoy that freedom. He should overcome not only the physical obstacles, but also enjoy economic self-sufficiency and security and live a life free from cultural and intellectual regimentation.

Rights and Duties

The individual occupies a very high position in the philosophy of M. N. Roy. Society consists of individual men and women and the worth of any society is determined by the standard of the individuals. A good society can be made only by good men. The individual was neglected at the beginning

but he came to the forefront as a result of the Renaissance. The vast knowledge accumulated in course of time opened a new scope for individual men and women. The barriers of religious dogma were broken.

During the first phase of his political career, M. N. Roy put more emphasis only on the duties of the individuals as citizens of a country. That was due to the influence of Marxism on his life. However, there was a change in his outlook after a few years and he came to the conclusion that duties alone would make the individual merely a cog in the machinery of the state. The purpose of life would be lost in the political arena and life would be devoid of any essence. He began to put more emphasis on the liberty of the individual, but he did not ignore the role of the individual as a citizen of a country. Individual freedom could not be absolute on account of social responsibility. However, the individual was not to be sacrificed for the state. M. N. Roy warned that it would be a mistake to worship the "collective ego" and forget the existence of the individual. He did not want the individual to lose the consciousness of his dignity as in Communist and Socialist states. The individual was to play a double role. He was to retain his freedom but he was also to perform his duties as a citizen. He had to fulfil his social obligations. The interests of other citizens could not be ignored.

M. N. Roy criticized capitalism on the ground that under it the individual cared more for his personal gain and ignored the interests of society. Profit motive was against good citizenship. According to M. N. Roy, capitalism could not last long for the simple reason that under it, the individual had the least possible obligation to the society in which he lived. Capitalism was a passing phase of economic development.

Religion

The view of M. N. Roy is that religious institutions exploit the freedom of mind and intellect and that is a great disservice to humanity. Religion made the cage of iron where the intellect was lost. Man developed a belief that he was the special creation of God and his place in the universe was unique. The whole universe was also created for his benefit and pleasure. It was contended that the gods served the purpose of man. The people were asked to believe in the existence of a life after death. Under the name of spiritual authority and religious sanction, many exploited the masses. A lot of injustice was done to the common man who was in spiritual bondage. He could not protest against the injustice done to him as such a protest was supposed to be against the will of God. The religious sentiments of the people enabled autocrats to rule mercilessly for a long time.

The view of M. N. Roy is that due to the Reformation movement, there was a change in the attitude of the people towards religion. The Reformation itself was a product of the Renaissance. The Renaissance brought about a revolt in man. It proclaimed the freedom of will and faith in the creative ability of man. It denied the authority of God. It was the beginning of a new road for mankind. It delivered reason from bondage and dogmas. Knowledge began to accumulate in different branches of learning. There was enormous progress in the knowledge of geography, astronomy, astrology, physics, chemistry, mathematics etc. The people said, "What an age! Learning

flourishes, the mind of man awakes. It is a joy to live." The result was that religion lost a good deal of hold on human mind. Society changed with fantastic speed. The existing social order, beliefs and regulations had to be changed to adjust to the new conditions created by the Renaissance.

M. N. Roy insisted that everything must be explained and nothing should be taken for granted. Every belief must have a ground and man must be able to reason for himself. The spirit of man must break the fetters of faith.

There are many who believe that religion can be reformed but M. N. Roy believed that it could not be reformed. Religion at best can be institutionalised. That means concentration of power, its unavoidable abuse, restriction of freedom and many kinds of social, psychological and intellectual corruption. "Once human mind has outgrown its infancy, when spiritual needs could be satisfied by the naive rationalism of primitive religion, faith in the supernatural conceived either as many gods or one God or impersonal Providence, places fetters on the possibility of human development. For the sake of further spiritual development—intellectual growth, moral uplift and cultural progress—they must burst." Religion cannot survive the attack of free mind in any form or kind.

Nationalism

M. N. Roy did not accept the theory of nationalism as an important aspect of civilisation. According to him, "Nationalism is a sentiment, primarily. Its appeal is mainly to emotion." No scientific politics can be founded on an emotional theory. The theory of nationalism is an outdated theory which is not suited to the present political and social atmosphere. Nationalism is not a "historical necessity". Nationalism might have been important as a theory of colonial expansion and capitalistic exploitation, but with the coming of socialistic ideas, those ardent national feelings must die out. The world has become smaller and smaller and there is no place for the narrow ideas of national frontiers. M. N. Roy pointed out from the history of Germany and Italy how ardent nationalism ultimately led to the rise of Fascism which killed the very spirit of human existence. M. N. Roy was prepared to oppose any idea of nationalism, even to make Indian nationalism the goal of the people.

According to M. N. Roy, nationalism is not enough. It is the faith of a dead period. To sail with nationalism would mean suicide to mankind. Nationalism and patriotism had their day and to persist in them would jeopardise the future of the entire human race.

According to M. N. Roy, nationalism is a medieval mentality. It is a totalitarian dogma. It postulates that nation is more important than all those individuals who compose it taken together and therefore all of them must sacrifice and may have to be sacrificed, for the sake of the nation. A nation is an abstract and fictitious entity. It cannot claim the sacrifices and undivided loyalty of the individual. Nation is also, like Society, a class which tries like a monster to swallow the individual. It cannot be reconciled with radicalism. It is dangerous. It narrows the gaze of a revolutionary. It leads to Fascism and irrationalism.

Internationalism

M. N. Roy stood for world unity. According to him, the problems of mankind will continue as long as the whole mankind is not united. A study of history brought him to the conclusion that the dream of one world may be realised some day.

According to M. N. Roy, the present would is suffering mostly because of burning nationalism. Nobody is prepared to think in terms of mankind as a whole. The world has been divided into small national boundaries and that does not leave much scope to think for the whole world as one unit. The view of M. N. Roy was that national ambitions must be forgotten. That is a pre-condition for higher thinking to avoid wars in future. World peace will remain an impossibility so long as nations care for their own interests and forget the interests of others. A solution can be found in world unity alone.

M. N. Roy was opposed to nationalism and supported internationalism on many grounds. According to him, internationalism would eliminate international rivalry in the economic field. National considerations led to imperialism. We must stop the possible growth of imperial tendency and that can be done only by putting a restraint on national feelings. The world cannot prosper if individual nations forget their responsibility towards the whole of mankind. M. N. Roy suggested the surrender of national economic problems to international commissions. He also wanted the ending of the exploitation of the backward and under-developed countries by the richer countries. International trade should be changed from a struggle by the nations to get one another into unpayable debt to a mutually advantageous exchange of real wealth. In this way, international trade will be a supporter for international society. Mere competition for international markets will lead to depression on one hand and dumping in another and the result would be poverty in the midst of plenty. According to M. N. Roy, the world can get rid of much of its poverty and unemployment if the entire world is taken as a unit and the nation states are dissolved.

The internationalism of M. N. Roy was a grand product of his intellectual genius. Between man on one side and mankind on the other, he found no other compromise. He sought to foster the growth of the individuals and the international society. He felt that individuals alone are the seeds of mankind. He was aware of the problems that stood in the way of world unity. He realised that instead of being united, there were more and more of conflicts in the world. The political developments in the world were not favourable for world unity. National feelings rose above socialistic principles. The workers of all countries did not unite themselves against the capitalistic exploiters. As a matter of fact, the workers and capitalists joined hands to fight against the workers and common men of other countries. The original socialistic belief that mankind should be divided between the rich and the poor failed in practice. The socialists did not behave as real socialists. The Communists and the Socialists suffered from national psychosis. That is why M. N. Roy said that there were no Communists at all in the world today. Communism had become the most extreme form of nationalism. M. N. Roy was disillusioned with the Communistic world because they preached internationalism but in fact practised an acute form of nationalism. M. N. Roy

suggested Radicalism as the path to attain internationalism. He loved internationalism and wanted the whole world united as a single family.

Dictatorship

The rise of dictatorship in certain countries caused great anxiety in the mind of M. N. Roy. He found that human freedom was in danger. Parliamentary democracy showed signs of weakness before Communim and Fascism. To quote Roy, "Dictatorship tends to perpetuate itself. Planned economy under political dictatorship disregards freedom on the pleas of efficiency, collective effort and social progress. Consequently, a higher form of democracy in the socialist society, as it is conceived at present, becomes an impossibility. Dictatorship defeats its professed end". It is true that the idea of democratic dictatorship attracted M. N. Roy for some time but ultimately he came to the conclusion that the combination of democracy and dictatorship was an impossibility.

Fascism

The view of M. N. Roy was that Fascism was not only an enemy of democracy, it was also the most dangerous enemy of human civilisation. The rise of the Fascist Parties in Germany and Italy indicated the growing sense of frustration. Fascism believed in holiness and heroism. It thrived on intellectual narrowness and mental poverty. It subordinated the individual sense of judgement under the iron heels of hero worship. It placed the state above everything and considered the individuals as particles of dust which could be sacrificed for the group or state. He wanted the people to resist Fascism at any cost in order to protect the freedom of the individual.

The view of Roy was that Fascism represented not only the methods and tactics of certain aggressive states but also a philosophy of retrogression which debased human personality and caused complete annihilation of man's moral nature. Fascism was the last defence of capitalism and constituted a revolt against all modern trends and was a hark-back to medievalism. It aimed at "bolstering up capitalism and imperialism and ideologically represented a retreat from reason". It stands for a totalitarian state which though sought by the individual as a refuge against capitalist society, eventually crushes him. It was a rallying ground for counter-revolutionary and reactionary forces.

This explains why M. N. Roy supported the Government of India which was fighting against the Fascist Powers during the World War II.

Law and Liberty

M. N. Roy did not advocate any separate theory of law. However, he made some observations on law while discussing the problems relating to human nature and freedom. He did not consider law as opposed to liberty. He wanted the laws of the state to be rational like the laws of nature. According to him, with the dawn of awareness of his moral and rational nature, the individual started obeying laws voluntarily. The sanction of law was in his own rational nature and not in any authority above him. Roy did not

consider law as the result of divine will or the expression of the desire of the dominant class to maintain its supremacy or a command of a superior to an inferior. According to him, law was based on reason and aimed at attaining more and more freedom. Dr. G. P. Bhattacharjee writes, "Though Roy tried to establish a harmony between law and liberty and acknowledged the importance of society, his view about the relation of inter-dependence between individuals as end and society as means is too mechanical a concept likely to become dangerous in practice". (Evolution of Political Philosophy of M. N. Roy, p. 189).

Indian Spiritualism

M. N. Roy was not enamoured of Indian spiritualism which was raised to mystical heights by Vivekananda, Aurobindo and Mahatma Gandhi. He did not accept their view that the West was hungering for Indian spirituality. According to Roy, the praise of Indian spiritualism was an attempt to revive the backward pre-capitalist social conditions of India. To quote Roy, "The decline of the West being in reality only the decline of capitalism, the crisis of Western civilisation means only disintegration of the bourgeois social order. In that context, India's spiritual mission appears to be a mission with a mundane purpose, namely to sabotage a social system based upon the love of lucre and lust for power. It indicates an attachment to pre-capitalist social conditions which are idealized. Objectively, it is therefore the token of a reactionary social outlook".

The view of Roy was that Sankara and Ramanuja represented mental dogmatism, medievalism and scholasticism. Sankara was Brahmanical counterpoise to the liberating forces of Buddhism. The view of Roy was that Buddhism was a revolutionary force making drastic inroads into Brahmanical scholasticism and priestcraft.

Roy did not accept the view that India excelled the West in richness, subtlety and variety of its philosophical background or ideological heritage. His view was that India's claim of moral superiority over the West was an exaggeration. To quote him, "The claim that the Indian people as a whole are morally less corrupt, emotionally purer, idealistically less worldly, in short spiritually more elevated than the bulk of the Western society, is based upon a wanton disregard for reality."

Roy and Mahatma Gandhi

To begin with, M. N. Roy praised Mahatma Gandhi and compared him with St. Thomas Aquinas and Savonarola. However, he later on became a critic of Gandhiji. He went to the extent of describing Gandhism as "a mass of platitudes and hopeless self-contradictions". His view was that the philosophy of Gandhi was an endeavour to preserve the status quo. Gandhiji's philosophy of non-violence was not at all feasible in the modern society. The Ahimsa of Gandhiji was a subtle intellectual device for concealing the capitalist exploitation of the country. Roy condemned the economics of Charkha of Gandhiji as reactionary. He described Gandhism as weak and watery reformism. He described Gandhiji's Congress as the spinners' association. He did not accept the ethical or spiritual basis of the constructive programme of Gandhiji. He described Gandhiji as the embodiment of Indian backward-

ness and condemned his Quit India movement as "the mischief of whipping up forces which undermined the Indian home front." To quote Roy, "The social basis of Gandhism is cultural backwardness, its intellectual mainstay superstition. The Gandhian Utopia is a static society, a state of absolute social stagnation."

M. N. Roy differed from Gandhiji in many ways. While Gandhiji was a spiritualist, Roy was a materialist. Gandhiji was a believer in God and considered himself to be a messenger of God. To quote Gandhiji, "God has chosen me as His instrument for presenting non-violence to India". Roy was an atheist and was opposed to the idea of God. For Gandhiji, God is the source of justice, benevolence and kindness. The view of Roy was that God is an obstacle in the path of human freedom and hence he rejected the idea of God. Gandhiji was a religious man and he wanted to assimilate religion with politics. To quote him, "For me politics bereft of religion is absolute dirt, ever to be shunned". Again, "I cannot conceive of politics as divorced from religion." As Gandhiji was a theist, he traced morality to religion. According to him, moral laws were made by God and no one had a right to violate them. Roy rejected transcendental approach and believed that morality could be traced in the biological nature of man. He criticised Gandhiji for his ideals of sacrifice, crucifixion of flesh and abstinence. Roy was hedonist and he favoured the satisfaction of human desires. Gandhiji's ideal was simple living and high thinking. The view of Roy was that high thinking had never been contrary to high living. If Gandhiji was an advocate of "voluntary poverty", Roy was a champion of "plenty". Gandhiji criticised modern industrial progress but Roy welcomed it. Gandhiji talked about other-worldliness. Roy rejected the ideas of other-worldliness, salvation, rebirth etc. Roy regarded the ideas of Gandhiji regarding the caste system and mixing of religion with politics as reactionary and anachronistic.

The approach of Roy was metaphysical while that of Gandhiji was religious. However, both rejected the materialistic interpretation of history. For both of them, the only cause of the troubles of mankind is that "man has lost faith in himself." Both think that unless man is changed, any social structure cannot bring any good. The remaking of man precedes the remaking of society. Both Gandhiji and Roy were advocates of absolute values. Though Roy did not believe in God or religion, he did not teach the sacrifice of principles for expediency. Like Gandhiji, he advocated the employment of noble means for noble ends. Both of them were conscious of the great danger involved in the process of the concentration of power. Both of them were against concentration of power and favoured decentralisation in every field, political, economic and social. Both of them advocated small units of organisation where those directly engaged in the work in the units were to control and administer them. Both of them opposed planning because of its centralisation, its emphasis on big industries and its incapacity to appreciate that genuine improvement should evolve from the bottom and cannot be achieved from the top. Both emphasized individual initiative and cooperation and conceived of the goal of social progress in terms of the many-sided development of individual human-beings. Both of them appreciated what was good in parliamentary democracy but were also critical of its defects. Both of them considered political parties unnecessary and

even harmful. Both of them wanted Panchayats or the organisation of local community to be the real seats of all authority. Both of them were opposed to coercion as a means to social change and progress. Both of them were devoted to develop in the people initiative and spirit of reliance so that they did not look to the Government or any outside agency for help. New Humanism of Roy and Gandhism throw the challenge to all those doctrines of recent times which advocate to submerge the individual in society. Both of them present a social philosophy which will protect the individuality of man. New Humanism and Gandhism are opposed to Fascism and Socialism. Both claim to supplement Marxian economics with humanism. It appears that New Humanism and Gandhism are not opposed to each other in their social, political and economic approach. Both of them appear to be standing on the same footing. The difference is that while Gandhiji takes the shelter of religion, Roy moves forward and twists science according to his taste. Both of them were hostile to politics. They did not enter politics willingly but circumstances compelled them to do so. According to Gandhiji, "Politics is like a snake's coil". Roy writes, "As a matter of fact, I may tell you that I feel uncomfortable in politics. I feel like a fish out of water".

Estimate of M. N. Roy

The critics of Roy maintain that his thinking is not an original contribution to philosophy. His humanistic doctrine is not a novel one. Roy contends that his New Humanism is unique because it is based on those facts which new science has discovered. This claim is not accepted. It is pointed out that the whole of the philosophy of Roy is a reinforcement of the philosophy of French enlightenment, its scientific treatment is borrowed from American New Humanism which is not only similar in name but also in its content. Roy based his New Humanism on the broad outlines of humanism on which all contemporary humanists agree. Roy does not disclose any new truth in his philosophy. His cosmology is based on mechanistic materialism and the same was the case with French enlightenment. Roy combines sensationalism with rationalism. The method adopted by him is also not his own. His assertion that society is the sum total of individuals and not a personality distinct from individuals, that state should not interfere in man's ethical, intellectual, economic or in any other sphere of life, that democracy should be established with the help of sovereign individual etc., are those beliefs which are the doctrines of the eighteenth century. His description of the relation between the individual and society is simply individualism. Roy does not agree with the capitalistic system of individualism, but he also does not advocate socialistic methods and opposes social ownership of the means of production. His concept of cooperative economy is not original. It is contended that the whole philosophy of Roy is nothing but individualistic and liberal doctrines of the eighteenth century dressed in new attires. Even those attires are not prepared in the manufactory of Roy. They are taken from New Humanism of America which is associated with the religion of humanity and neo-rationalism. There is not the least difference between Roy and Ward, an exponent of American New Humanism. Like Roy, Ward is also interested in the works of biologists, geneticists and geologists. Roy does not appreciate the capitalistic way of economic organisation, but the organisation suggested by him is borrowed from the New Humanism of the United States. It is contended that Roy forgot to tear the

label from the bottle of American New Humanism which itself is nothing but distilled individualism.

Roy was more of a critic than an original constructive thinker. He did not contribute any integral system of thought or a coherent political philosophy. However, he presented a synthesis of different elements of thought. Even his synthesis was not very profound or original. In spite of this, Roy is regarded as the most learned and most competent scholar among the recent writers on political thought. His philosophy of Radical Humanism has influenced and is likely to influence the Democratic Socialist movement in India. Jayaprakash Narayan acknowledged the influence of Roy on his own thinking.

The contribution of Roy to the secularisation of Indian thinking and the need for the introduction of rationalism in politics cannot be denied. His criticism of the spiritualist culture "as an instrument of reaction and a bulwark against higher civilisation" and a check upon the spiritual liberation is very much relevant to the problems of social emancipation and reason-based political system in this country. His attack on the party politics and the defects of the democratic system and emphasis on the value of individuality and freedom should inspire the intellectuals and the political activists.

Roy started his political career as a revolutionary and ended as a liberal humanist. He tried to bring heaven on the earth. Dr. G. P. Bhattacharjee points out that Roy soon realised that "if heaven cannot be achieved, the earth at least can be repaired. He died a disillusioned man but possibly not a wholly disappointed man." (Evolution of Political Philosophy of M. N. Roy, p. 239).

Prof. B. N. Dasgupta writes, "Roy remains unparalleled in realm of human affairs as an exponent at a time when particularly the East and some countries of the West were passing through feverish turmoil for self-determination and emancipation" (M. N. Roy—Quest for Freedom, p. 37). Roy was a man of action and he wanted the world to adopt his philosophy as the healing light of the future. Unfortunately, he did not find time to elaborate his thesis of New Humanism and also could not get an opportunity to put it into practice.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Awasthi, R.K. : *Scientific Humanism*, Research Pu blica tions, Social Siences, Delhi.

Bhattacharjee, G.P. : *Evolution of the Political Philosophy of M.N. Roy*, Minerva Association, Calcutta, 1971.

Blackham, H.J. : *M.N. Roy, Philosopher, Revolutionary*, Renaissance Publishers, Calcutta, 1956.

Blackham, H.J. : *Humanism*, Penguin, 1968.

Dasgupta, B.N. : *M.N. Roy's Quest for Freedom*, Firma K.L. Mukhopadhyaya, Calcutta.

Dhar, Niran jan : *The Political Thought of M.N. Ray*, Eureka Publishers, Calcutta, 1966.

Jena, Krishna Chandra : *Contribution of Manbendra Nath Roy to Political Philosophy*, S. Chand & Company (Pvt) Ltd., New Delhi.

Roy, M.N. : *Materialism : An Outline of the History of Scientific Thought*, Renaissance Publishers, Calcutta, 1951.

Roy, M.N. : *Scientific Politics*, Indian Renaissance Association, 1941.

Roy, M.N. : *Poverty or Plenty*, Renaissance Publishers, Calcutta, 1943.

Roy, M.N. : *New Orientation*, Renaissance Publishers, Calcutta, 1946.

Roy, M.N. : *New Humanism : A Manifesto*, Renaissance Publishers, Calcutta, 1947.

Roy, M.N. : *Reason, Romanticism and Revolution*, Renaissance Publishers, Calcutta, 1955.

Roy, M.N. : *Science and Philosophy*, Renaissance Publishers, Calcutta.

Roy, M.N. : *Memoirs*, Allied Publishers, Calcutta, 1964.

Roy, M.N. : *India in Transition*, Nachiketa, Bombay, 1971.

Roy, M.N. : *Politics, Power and Parties*, Renaissance Publishers, Calcutta, 1960.

Roy, M.N. : *What Do We Want*, Nachiketa Publications, Bombay, 1971.

Roy, M.N. and Spratt, Philip : *Beyond Communism*, Renaissance Publishers, Calcutta, 1947.

Roy, M.N. : *The Future of Indian Politics*, R. Bishop, London, 1926.

Saxena, Kiran : *Indian Political Thought : Gandhism and Roy's New Humanism*, New Delhi, 1978.

Sharma, B.S. : *The Political Philosophy of M.N. Roy*, National Publishing House, Delhi, 1965.

CHAPTER XXIV

The Communist Movement and Thought in India

The Russian Revolution of 1917 had its effect on India. B. C. Pal approved of the Bolshevik Revolution and pointed out its relevance to India's struggle for independence. Lala Lajpat Rai took keen interest in labour activities. His friends and followers took keen interest in Marxian theory and Marxian economy. Lajpat Rai did not accept the theory of class war and advocated the theory of class coöperation.

M. N. Roy was the first Indian leader who was converted to and convinced of the Marxist theory and Marxist path. He played an important part in the formulation of the Comintern's first pronouncement on the colonial question. In his first draft, Lenin stressed the "necessity of all Communist parties to render assistance to the bourgeois democratic movement". M. N. Roy wanted the Comintern to "assist exclusively the institution and development of the Communist movement in India". He wanted the establishment of a Communist Party in India with the assistance of the Comintern and that party was to devote itself exclusively to the organisation of the broad popular masses for the struggle for the class interests of the working people. Lenin appears to have stuck to his position but out of regards for M. N. Roy, he modified his draft of the original thesis slightly. M. N. Roy was appointed a member of the Executive Council of the Communist International.

In 1921, S. A. Dange published a book entitled "Gandhi and Lenin". He organised a library of Marxist literature. He published translations of Marxist classics. He established a publishing house and published the Indu-Prakash, a Marathi language Daily and an English Weekly called Socialist. Work in favour of Communism was done in Bengal by Muzaffar Ahmad, in Lahore by Ghulam Hussain, in Madras by S. Chettiar and in the United Provinces by Shaukat Usmani. In 1922, the Communists in India tried to penetrate into the nationalist movement with a view to capture the Congress organisation at the Gaya session of the Congress but they failed.

Organised communism came to India when the followers of M. N. Roy came to this country. Nalini Gupta returned to India in 1921 on behalf of M. N. Roy. Abani Mukherji came to India in 1923 on behalf of Virendranath Chattopadhyaya. Both had been members of the terrorist organisations in Bengal before they went outside India. Their activities resulted in the Kanpur conspiracy case in 1924. The charge against the Communist leaders was that they were organising a conspiracy to overthrow the Government of India by violent means. The accused in that case were Dange, Muzaffar Ahmad, Shaukat Usmani and Nalini Gupta. The trial was not spectacular. M. N. Roy lamented, "With a better lot in the dock and less stupid heads at the Bar, the Cawnpur case could have been made an epoch-making event

in our political history". The effect of the trial was that the Communist movement in India was crippled as it removed from the scene the Communist leaders who were doing work in different parts of the country.

Round about 1924, the Communist International developed doubts about the ability of M. N. Roy to deliver the goods and it was decided to adopt new tactics to strengthen the Communist movement in India. It was agreed to adopt a scheme of direct contact between the Comintern and the Communist organisations and groups in British India. However, the Communist organisations in India were directed through the Communist Party of Great Britain and Rajni Palme Dutt became an important figure in that connection. R. P. Dutt was one of the founders of the British Communist Party in 1920. He was elected to the Central Committee and Politbureau. He was a member of the Executive Council of the London India League. He acted as a coordinator between the Communist Party of India and the Communist International. He was a great architect of the Communist policy and programme in India.

R. P. Dutt published in 1926 a book called "Modern India". In that book, he explained the modern basis of imperialism in India. He pointed out that British capital was the pre-dominant partner in the industrialisation of India. His conclusion was that "the identification of the Indian national interests with the interests of Indian capitalism is false. On the contrary, imperialism is today absorbing Indian capitalism and preparing an economic and political partnership which will eventually take the form of Dominion Status. Dominion Status is the expression of the Indian capitalist aim of partnership with the British bourgeoisie. But the same cannot express the interests of the masses. The interests of the masses demand complete freedom from imperialist exploitation and this can only be realised by complete Independence". The contention of R. P. Dutt was that the Indian bourgeoisie could not be trusted to lead the struggle because "their interests are already heavily entangled with imperialism and this dependence is increasing. The Indian national struggle will be carried to success by the strength of the working masses whose interests are completely divorced from imperialism". About the role of Gandhiji, R. P. Dutt wrote, "The central significance of this period consisted in the fact that the national movement became a mass movement. For the first time within the rank of nationalist politicians, he pushed beyond the narrow circle of Congress Council, Assembly and bureaucratic politics and endeavoured to bring his message to the millions of peasants and other workers. In them, in the moment of his power, he found his strength. from the moment that he became divorced from them his decline began". Again, "The second great achievement of Gandhi consists in this that he brought before the masses a policy of action. Non-cooperation is the attempt to force the Government to submit by the use of the power of the united action of the masses. There is no question of a gentle, persuasive, spiritual argument. It is a question of power". The view of Dutt was that non-violence was merely a cover for class interests and maintenance of class relations of power. The spirituality of Gandhiji was merely an expression of that class interest. All the parasitic and propertied classes had to weave round themselves a fog of confused language, superstition, traditions, religion and reverence in order to hide from the masses the fact of their exploitation. He also maintained that Gandhiji was cooperating with the Government.

The view of R. P. Dutt was that the movement of the masses demanded two things: "First, organisation of the masses and second a programme of direct appeal". He agreed that the Indian National Congress could serve that purpose but he also realised that the "interests of the bourgeoisie are suspicious of and hostile to the action of the masses. Therefore of two things one can happen: either the bourgeoisie in fear of their class interests will abandon the national struggle, or if the bourgeoisie endeavoured to pursue the national struggle, they will have to recognise that the national struggle can only be carried on by the masses and that for their own interest they will have to assist the agitation and organisation of the masses." The view of Dutt was that "the organisation of the Congress is sketchy, lives chiefly in committees and is not closely linked with the masses or their needs. The programme is even weaker. Swaraj is treated as indefinable mystery". The suggestion of Dutt was that "a revived nationalist movement will have to take up very much seriously the question of the peasants and the workers, their organisation and their needs".

Rajni Palme Dutt accepted Swaraj as the aim of the nationalist movement in India but he defined Swaraj as independence from imperialist domination. Moreover, Independence was not an end in itself because "real liberation is social—that is, the ending of class divisions and exploitation by the common entry of the whole people in the possession of their country (ultimately on a world scale) into the wealth and means of livelihood, into the common sharing of work and the return on work." Dutt criticised the Western form of parliamentary democracy which makes a "mockery of popular representation and whose so-called liberties are an obvious sham". He maintained that the nationalist movement in India should concentrate on a fight for winning the elementary civil rights of free speech, press meeting and combination. He wanted the left nationalist elements to gather round a popular national programme. The nationalist movement must be based upon the masses of the nation. It cannot follow the bourgeois line of cooperation or semi-cooperation with imperialism. It must combine the struggle for national liberation with the struggle for the immediate needs of the peasants, the workers and the petty bourgeoisie.

The view of R. P. Dutt was that the working class movement had to be separated from the nationalist movement and separately organised at some stage or the other. However, the organisation of an independent working class movement was not an immediate problem as Dutt had faith in the leaders of the nationalist movement in India. His ideal was a new national movement based on the workers and peasants, with a political and social programme expressing the interests of the masses.

A large number of British Communists were sent to India to help the Communists in this country. Percy E. Glading was the first to come to India. He was followed by George Allison who arrived in Bombay in April 1926. He took a prominent part in the labour troubles in Bombay and Bengal as a result of which he was apprehended, prosecuted and convicted and sentenced to 18 months' rigorous imprisonment. He was deported on the expiry of his sentence. His place was taken by Phillip Spratt. He devoted all his energy to the develoment of the Communist Party of India. He was joined by Benjamin Francis Bradley who also took an active part in the organisation of the Workers' and Peasants' Party and the employees of cotton mills

and railways. H. L. Hutchison also came to Bombay in 1928 but his mission was not a success.

Spratt did a lot of work in India. He planted the seeds of revolt in the Punjab. He set up the Workers' and Peasantrs' Party in the United Provinces. Branches were set up in Delhi, Allahabad, Meerut, Gorakhpur and Jhansi. There was a steady stream of Communist literature into India and different methods were employed to smuggle that literature into India without its being captured by the Government of India.

The Communists had also managed to acquire great influence in the trade unions in India. The Madras Union was established by B. P. Wadia in 1918. The All-India Trade Union Congress was established in 1920. The All-India Railwaymen's Federation was started in 1925. The Communists tried to capture the key trade unions with a view to utilising them for the political ends of their party. From 1926 to 1928, the influence of the Communists increased. They started several weekly journals like the Kranti in the Marathi language.

Communist activity was abruptly cut short by the arrest of 31 of its important leaders from different parts of India on 20 March 1929, including Spratt, Bradley, Muzaffar Ahmad, Shaukat Usmani and S. A. Dange. Hutchison was arrested a few days later. There were apprehensions and searches throughout the country. The Communist leaders were prosecuted and the trial court on 16 January 1933 convicted and sentenced all but four of the 31 accused to varying terms of imprisonment in the famous Meerut conspiracy case. The Allahabad High Court confirmed all the findings of the trial court but reduced their sentences. It is rightly pointed out that the Meerut conspiracy case "placed Communism on a sure footing in India". It made the Indian Communists martyrs and gave them a great propaganda opportunity which was exploited to the maximum. To quote Spratt, "On the whole, the revelation of our secret methods caused people to admire us. We had done what most youngmen wanted to do. We had our opportunity in the Sessions Court to make political statements and these were widely published in the press. Several of them were long enough to make a short book, and altogether no doubt most of what can be said in favour of Communism was said". (Blowing Up India, p. 52).

In 1929, M. N. Roy was expelled from the Comintern. Under the leadership of Stalin, the Comintern line on India was decisive and absolute in Indian Communist circles. The new policy involved opposition to Gandhiji, Nehru, Subhas Chandra Bose and the Congress Party who were considered to be counter-revolutionaries. It was maintained that Gandhiji and the Congress had been repudiated by the masses. Efforts were also made to form a strong, illegal Communist Party in India.

During the period from 1930 to 1935, the Communists not only held aloof from the freedom struggle led by the Indian National Congress but also did everything to weaken and sabotage the same. While the patriotic Indians were boycotting foreign cloth, the Communists advocated the use of foreign cloth as a gesture of solidarity with the workers of Lancashire. If Gandhiji advocated the methods of non-violent resistance, the Communists asserted the right to use violence. They also insulted the National Flag of India on the sands of Chowpathy in Bombay. To the Communists in

India, the national struggle in India was merely strengthening a sector of world capitalism and imperialism. In 1934, the Communists gave a call for a country-wide strike of all textile workers and the strike was actually started. The Communist Party was declared illegal in July 1934 alongwith a few trade unions under its control and the Young Workers League.

In March 1936, R. P. Dutt and Bradley published their thesis entitled "The Anti-Imperialist People's Front" in India. They described the Indian National Congress as merely the united front of the Indian people in the nationalist struggle and advised the Communists to join the Congress and utilise its organisation to strengthen the left wing within the Congress called the Congress Socialist Party and oust the reactionary right-wing elements in the Congress. The Communists, the Congress Socialist Party and the Trade Unionists planned to organise a popular front on the basis of a common minimum programme. Jayaprakash Narayan welcomed the Communists in the Congress Socialist Party to transform the Indian National Congress. To quote Jayaprakash Narayan, "We should work rather with the object of bringing the anti-imperialist elements under our ideological influence through propaganda and work among the masses so that finally they come to accept a proper anti-imperialist programme. I am not saying that by working in this manner we shall win the right-wing to our programme and thus convert the Congress. The Congress as it is constituted at present cannot hold together very long. The more successful we are in pushing our programme, the nearer the day when a split will occur in it." The Communists joined the Congress Socialist Party and through its membership they acquired the membership of the Indian National Congress. The result was that the Communist Party which had been declared illegal in July 1934 began to work in a legal manner.

The alliance between the Communists and the Congress Socialist Party did not work as the Communists did not show a spirit of cooperation. Their object was merely to isolate the Congress leadership from the rank and file of the country and capture the larger organisation for their party ends. Everything was done to belittle the role and inspiration of the nationalist movement led by the Congress. The Communists tried to implement their "Trojan horse" strategy. They complained that the failures of Mahatma Gandhi had weakened the anti-imperialist content in the Lahore Resolution of 1929 on complete Independence. However, they did not succeed in their objective. They could neither capture the Congress leadership nor make it accept their programme nor adopt their slogans. So long as the personality of Mahatma Gandhi dominated the national scene, the Communists could not succeed so far as the Congress was concerned. However, the Communists succeeded in causing a split in the All-India Students' Federation and the All-India Kisan Sabha which had been built up by the Congress Socialists. The All-India Trade Union Congress virtually became the preserve of the Communists. The Congress Socialist Party saw the futility and danger of working with the Communists and expelled them in 1940. While parting, the Communists carried with them almost intact three of the best organised state branches of the Congress Socialist Party in Andhra, Tamil Nadu and Kerala.

Upto August 1939, the Communists in India were praising the Soviet Union under Stalin and condemning Hitler. However, they found them-

selves in an awkward position after Stalin entered into a Non-Aggression Pact with Hitler just before the beginning of the World War II. Overnight, Hitler became a friend of peace and England and France became the imperialist war-mongers. The Communists condemned England for dragging India into an imperialist war against her will. Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru were denounced as saboteurs of Indian independence and agents of imperialism. The members of the Congress Socialist Party were described as henchmen of Mahatma Gandhi. The Communists induced the workers to go on strike to impair war production. On 2 October 1939, they organised a strike in Bombay in which 90,000 workers are stated to have participated. The Government of India took strong action against the Communists by arresting their leaders. The Communists continued to be arrested in 1940.

However, everything changed after Hitler attacked Russia on 22 June 1941. The imperialist war became a "People's war". The Communists decided to support the Government of India in every way in their war effort as England and Russia were to fight together against Hitler. The Government of India released the Communist leaders from detention. The ban on the Communist Party was lifted and it could now work as a lawful party. The Communist Party recommended that the Cripps proposals be accepted and it attacked the Congress for rejecting them. It condemned the Quit India Resolution as "misguided" and "pernicious". In September 1942, the Communist Party passed the following resolution in which it emphasized the multi-national character of the Indian Sub-Continent : "Every section of the Indian people which has a contiguous territory as its homeland, common historical tradition, common language, culture, psychological make-up and common economic life would be recognised as a distinct nationality with the right to exist as an autonomous state within the free Indian Union or federation and will have the right to secede from it if it may so desire. Thus free India of tomorrow would be a federation or union of autonomous states of the various nationalities such as Pathans, Western Punjabis (dominantly Muslims), Sikhs, Sindhis, Hindustanis, Rajasthanis, Gujaratis, Bengalis, Assamese, Beharies, Oriyas, Andhras, Tamils, Karnatakas, Maharashtrians, Keralas etc.". The Communist Party of India also endorsed the Pakistan demand of the Muslim League with a view to penetrate the Muslim masses.

The Communist Party gave full support to the Government of India. The underground resistance leaders of the Congress Socialist Party were condemned as fifth columnists. The Communists considered it as their duty to spy on the Indian patriots and get them arrested wherever possible. They became police informers. There was complete cooperation between the officials of the Government of India and the members of the Communist Party which placed its services at the disposal of the Government of India against all those who took part in the Quit India movement and the Azad Hind Fauj of Subhas Chandra Bose. On the industrial front, the Communists did their utmost to keep the workers away from the nationalist movement. There were to be no strikes but more and more work for the Government. The workers were asked to forget the class struggle and work for increased production. The peasants were asked to forget their grievances and grow more food and surrender it to the Government to feed the armies.

For practically three years from 1942 to 1945, every active Indian patriot was either in jail or underground. That gave an opportunity to the Com-

munists to capture the labour, students, peasants and women organisations in the country. The All-India Trade Union Congress became a purely Communist front. The Communists infiltrated into the All-India Women's Conference.

In spite of all this, the Communist were isolated and discredited by 1945. Their efforts to destroy the influence of Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress leaders failed miserably. Their efforts to woo Mr. Jinnah and the Muslim League also failed. They lost support both among the peasants and the industrial workers. Their only influence was among the upper class intellectuals. When Mahatma Gandhi was released in 1944, the Communists tried to approach him but he refused to have anything to do with them. When the members of the Congress Working Committee were released in June 1945, the Congress resumed normal functioning and the Communists were expelled from the Congress.

Elections of 1945

In 1945, elections for the Provincial Assemblies in India were held on the basis of the Government of India Act, 1935. The Communist Party of India decided to contest the elections. This decision was a landmark in the evolution of Indian Communism. It divided the leadership of the Communist Party of India into "soft-line" and "hard-line" followers.

With its Election Manifesto of 1945, the Communist Party of India embraced the Indian political idea of representative Government as well as the basic concept of the unity of India as a single political unit. The provisional governmental structure proposed by the Communist Party of India was a Confederation of autonomous states as against the single federation plan of the Indian National Congress and the two-federation plan of the Muslim League. Its appeal was mainly to the middle class. It looked upon itself as the "unifier of the middle class with the working class in the towns and the peasantry in the villages." It envisaged industrial planning through "free and equal" cooperation of the state, management and labour. It proposed the abolition of landlordism but with maximum holdings of 100 acres. It was also stated that the Communist Party "will not touch the small Zamindar or the rich landlord".

The Communist Party put up 108 candidates for election but won only 8 seats. Six out of eight constituencies won by the Communist Party of India were labour constituencies.

Telengana

When India became independent in August 1947, the Communist Party decided to give support to the Nehru Government. Their underlying motive was to support Prime Minister Nehru against Sardar Patel who was the Deputy Prime Minister. The idea was to create a split in the Congress ranks. The Communist support to Nehru did not last long on account of a change in the Russian policy and world alignments. Communist agitation was very strong in the rural districts of Telengana in the State of Hyderabad. The peasant revolt in Telengana in 1946 was a spontaneous act of defiance by the ruthlessly oppressed peasantry. It was also a nationalist revolt against the Nizam who was determined to keep Hyderabad outside India as an In-

dependent state. It was also a Hindu nationalist rebellion against the Muslim despot.

The Communists had entrenched themselves in Telengana before the police action against Hyderabad in 1948. There was no law and order in that area which was practically ruled by the Communists. The Government of India decided to take strong action against the Communists. Between October and December 1950, there were no less than 344 serious incidents, including 96 murders, 151 attacks on the police and the military and 82 attacks on the home guards and village officials. During that period, the police killed 223 Communists and arrested 143 of them. They recovered from them guns and rifles alongwith ammunition and explosives. Towards the end of 1951, there was a decrease in terrorism.

Attempts were made by the Communists to persuade the police and the troops to desert their officers, murder their officers and join the Communist Party.

After Independence

The four years from 1947 to 1951 were probably the most crucial period for the Communist Party of India. It was a period marked by extreme fluctuations in its strategy and tactics. The Communist Party was not prepared for sustained underground activity and the Government of India took a few weeks to round up all the important leaders of the Communist Party of India and thereby paralyze its operating machinery.

In 1950, the Communist Party of India changed its policy and decided to resort to peaceful methods. This was partly due to the fact that the Soviet Union was changing its attitude towards India. It wanted to make capital out of India's foreign policy of neutrality and pulling India out of the Anglo-American Bloc into the Russian orbit. The Cominform issued a new directive to the Communist Party of India. To quote, "A sham independence was bestowed on India. But the interests of British imperialism remained 'sacred and inviolable'. The Mountbattens have departed but British imperialism remains and octopus-like grips India in its bloody tentacles. In these conditions, the task of the Indian Communists drawing on the experience of national liberation movement in China and other countries is naturally to strengthen the alliance of the working class with all the peasantry, to fight for the introduction of urgently needed agrarian reform and on the basis of common struggle for freedom and national independence of their country, against the Anglo-American imperialists oppressing it and against the reactionary big bourgeoisie and feudal princes collaborating with them—to unite all classes, parties, groups and organisations willing to defend the national independence and freedom of India."

The Politbureau was reconstituted in June 1950. It was decided to build up a mass party capable of playing a historical role in building the People's Democratic Front. The Front was to be a united front of workers, peasants, petty bourgeoisie and middle bourgeoisie and the parties that represented these classes based on the immediate programme of the Communist Party and on the fight for its realisation. For the purposes of forming such a front, non-Congress parties in India were to be divided into four categories: (1) Genuinely anti-imperialist parties and groups consisting of the Forward Bloc, the

Workers' and Peasants' Party, the Revolutionary Socialist Party and the United Socialist Organisation; (2) Non-imperialist parties and groups under a left cloak such as the Socialist Party of India; (3) Congress with the different factions and groups which were working inside and outside the party; and (4) Communal reactionary parties such as the Hindu Mahasabha, Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh, the Muslim League and the Akali Dal. The Communist Party would contact the parties in the first group and enter into a united front with them. There was no question of forming a united front with the second group. The third group, viz., the Congress was in a state of flux and should be watched carefully. A bitter fight against the fourth group would have to be waged.

On 17 September 1951, the Communist Party of India issued a statement that if the government withdrew the Preventive Detention Act, the Communist Party would give up terrorism in return and act as a legal party employing constitutional means to contest for power. Although the Government did not withdraw the Preventive Detention Act, it became lenient towards the Communist Party and released many Communists from detention.

Draft Programme (1951)

The Policy Statement was issued by the Politbureau of the Communist Party in May 1951 and that was followed by a Draft Programme. While making a detailed analysis of the situation in India, the programme stated: "India was still a dependent, semi-colonial country. The keys to military and naval defence were held by the British. Four years of the Nehru Government had belied the hopes of the masses in every respect. The people were convinced by their experience that the Congress Government was pledged to the protection and preservation of British capital, parasitic landlords and the princes. Promises made to the people had been broken in all spheres. Civil liberties had been suppressed. Therefore at this stage the immediate objective of the party was the first stage of revolution in a semi-colonial country and that, in view of the backwardness of the economic development of India and of the weakness of the mass organisation of the workers, peasants and the toiling intelligentsia, the Party did not find it possible to carry out immediately a socialist transformation in the country and was therefore not demanding the immediate establishment of socialism. The Politbureau, however, regarded as quite mature the task of replacing the present anti-democratic and anti-popular Government by a new Government of People's Democracy, created on the basis of a coalition of all democratic, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist forces in the country, capable of effectively guaranteeing the rights of the people." The practical task to be carried out by the new People's Democratic Government would be the following:—

(1) In the field of state structure, assuring the sovereignty of the people, unhampered freedom of conscience, speech, press, assembly and strike, the recognition of the right of all nationalities to self-determination, the re-constitution of the present artificial states into national states and the replacement of the police by a people's militia.

(2) In the field of agriculture, confiscation of land from the landlords without compensation and distribution to the peasants.

(3) In the field of national independence, severance from the Commonwealth of Nations, confiscation of all factories, banks etc. owned by the foreigners.

(4) In the field of foreign policy, India needed peace and peaceful development and the chief enemy of peace and the advocate of an aggressive war now was the United States of America.

The Communist Party did remarkably well in the first general elections held in 1952. It contested 49 Parliamentary seats and won 16. With 10 allies, the Communist Party of India became the largest opposition group in Parliament. In four State Assemblies, the Communist Party won large representation—62 in Madras, 42 in Hyderabad, 32 in Travancore-Cochin, 28 in West Bengal and smaller number of seats in Bombay, Assam, Orissa and Pepsu and in the electoral colleges for Tripura and Manipur. With 194 seats, the Communist Party of India was the largest party in the State Assemblies after the Congress Party.

Bid For Power

The Communist Party of India tried to assert its independence and that brought it into conflict with Moscow. The conflict was due to the differing perspectives of Moscow and the Communist Party of India regarding the class role of the Government of India led by Jawaharlal Nehru. After the outbreak of the Korean War, Nehru's foreign policy made a favourable impression on Peking and Moscow. However, the Communist Party of India was inclined to judge Nehru by his domestic policies which were considered by the Communist Party to be "anti-people". As the Cold War intensified, the Soviet Union began to appreciate the value of non-alignment and put Nehru in the "peace camp" and wanted the Communist Party of India to support him. Thus, the interests of international Communism clashed with the interests of Communists in India. The Communist Party of India did not see anything progressive in the economic and social programmes of Nehru and hence was not prepared to support him because of his foreign policy alone. To a majority of the Communists in India, the contradiction between the Nehru Government's policy of peace (foreign policy) and democracy (domestic policy) dissolved in the following three years. India became a friend of China as well as of the Soviet Union. The differences with Peking over Tibet were resolved and India and China jointly proclaimed the Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence. Chou En-lai came to Delhi in June 1954 and Nehru visited China the following November. In 1955, Khrushchev and Bulganin visited India. The Soviet Union offered to participate in India's economic development. In 1957, the Indian National Congress adopted a resolution declaring the establishment of a socialistic pattern of society as the goal of its economic policy and the same was endorsed by the Parliament of India.

There were certain happenings in the international field which helped the Communist Party of India to be more independent. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union lost its control of world Communism. Many Communist Party heads did not approve of the condemnation of Stalin by Khrushchev. Ajay Ghosh who had led the Indian delegation to the twentieth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, saw the reservations

and misgivings entertained by the several parties, particularly the Communist Party of China towards certain aspects of the new Soviet strategy. The observation of Ajoy Ghosh was, "The twentieth Congress not only ended the deification of Stalin but also demolished the belief in the infallibility of any party or leader." The riots in Poland and East Germany and the uprising in Hungary further weakened Moscow's leadership of world Communism. The Italian Communist Party made a virtual declaration of independence. In 1957, Mao Tse-tung openly attacked the twentieth Congress line at the Moscow meeting of the major world Communist Parties. By 1958, Sino-Soviet differences grew into a rift between the two nations at both Government and party levels. The Communist Party of India could have utilised the differences between Moscow and Peking to foster and consolidate the independence of India's Communism. That was the intention of Ajoy Ghosh but he died in 1961.

Second General Elections (1957)

The second general elections were held in 1957. On that occasion, the Communist Party of India made certain observations with regard to the achievements and failures of the Congress Government. With regard to the lapses of the Government, Communist Party was of the view that the record of the Congress Government was a failure on account of many reasons. While production increased, the condition of the masses was as miserable as before. Tax burdens were increased and the prices rose. Unemployment in rural and urban areas assumed colossal proportions. Wages lagged far behind the growth productivity. The eviction of tenants from land continued. Even the recommendations of the Planning Commission for agrarian reforms were not implemented. In spite of independence, the people continued to suffer in many ways. Pronouncement of socialism and the promulgation of plans alone were of no avail. A really democratic plan for India must make decisive inroads into the position of British capital in India and also of landlordism. It must weaken the position of monopoly capital in our economic and political life. The Congress Government was not prepared to do the same.

The Communist Party announced the following programme :—(1) In the field of industry, priority should be given to the development of heavy industries in the state sector. Protection should be given to national industries against foreign competition. There should be balanced development of various regions and maximum utilisation of existing capacities in organised industry. Small-scale and cottage industries should be encouraged to meet the increasing demands of the consumers.

(2) In order to develop resources for reconstruction, certain industries like banking, general insurance, aluminium, manganese, copper, iron, and coal mining should be nationalised. British-controlled plantations and jute mills must be nationalised. A ceiling must be put on the export of profits and the surplus must be taken as compulsory deposits. A ceiling be put on the profits of big industries and the excess profits should be taken as loan. The reserves of the large companies should be used for a National Development Pool. There must be state monopoly of foreign trade in principal commodities and the Privy purses of Princes must be abolished. The payment of compensation to the big landlords should be deferred.

There should be a drive against wastage in Government undertakings and projects. The salaries and allowances of highly paid officials should be reduced.

(3) To benefit the working class, the rationalisation drive must be stopped. The national minimum wage must be fixed and pending that decision, wages should be increased by 25 per cent. There must be social insurance for all industries. Unemployment benefit, housing facilities and the right to bonus should be guaranteed.

(4) In the field of agriculture, there should be reduction of rent burden and usurious interest. There should be a ceiling on land holdings. Surplus land should be taken without compensation and given to agricultural labour and peasants. Urgent agrarian reforms must be carried out. Labour and peasant committees should be set up to implement them. There should be a planned free distribution of all cultivable Government waste lands to poor peasants and agricultural labourers into three years and state aid to them. The debts of peasants to landlords and moneylenders should be scaled down. Unconscionable debts must be cancelled. The number of rural cooperatives of various kinds should be increased. Minimum wage for agricultural labourer must be fixed. Fair price must be guaranteed to peasants for their produce. Tubewells and electricity must be installed by Government and water rates must be reduced.

(5) In the field of education and health, there should be free and compulsory elementary education up to the age of 14 years. Adequate provision must be made for technical and scientific education on a large scale. Teachers must be paid adequate salaries. Provision should be made for more medical service and maternity homes in cities and countryside and supply of drinking water to all localities.

(6) For the electoral contest, it was declared that the Communist Party would strive for an understanding with Left parties such as the Praja Socialist and Socialist Parties, notwithstanding continuing differences with them on some issues. The Communist Party would also support all democratic individuals who stand for people's interests and oppose the Congress candidates. The party would uncompromisingly oppose communal parties who seek to divide the people with disruptive communal ideologies and reactionary policies.

As a result of the elections held in 1957, the Communist Party got a majority in Kerala and formed the ministry. However, the same was dismissed in 1959.

Third General Elections (1962)

On the occasion of the Third general elections held in 1962, the Communist Party of India issued its Election Manifesto in which it was stated, "Fourteen years have passed since the attainment of freedom by our country. These have been years of uninterrupted rule of the Congress which has always had a huge majority not only in the Indian Parliament, but also in practically all the State Legislatures. Few parties in countries of parliamentary democracy had such a long time. The Congress has, therefore, had ample time and opportunity to carry out its pledges. It has had ample time and

opportunity to put its promises into practice and lay the foundations of a happy, prosperous India. But the Congress has not kept faith with the people. The situation in the country is far from what it should be. Most of the promises given in the days when we were fighting for freedom remained unfulfilled. Developments are taking place in our economic, political and social life which cannot but cause deep concern to every patriot. All this would be admitted by every one, including those Congressmen who retained the idealism and fervour of the earlier days."

It was further stated in the Manifesto that the country had witnessed the completion of two Five-Year Plans and the commencement of the Third Five-Year Plan. The Communists had fully supported every step taken by the Government that strengthened national economy. They had also stressed that the Second Five-Year Plan had a number of positive features such as the growth of the public sector, the building of three steel plants and machine-building industries, the construction of several irrigation and power projects and the manufacturing of a number of articles which were formerly imported into India from foreign countries. "The advance which our economy has registered has been facilitated enormously by the relations of co-operation that have been established between our country on the one hand and the Soviet Union and other socialist countries on the other. This co-operation which our party has always advocated in India's national interest, has been a big factor in the building of heavy and basic industries in the state sector."

The same Manifasto contained a criticism of the Congress Government. To quote, "Congress leaders and the Government proclaimed that their policies would lead to rapid development of industry and agriculture. But the growth has been extremely uncertain and tardy. The survey carried out by the United Nations shows that the rate of growth of our economy is painfully slow. It lags far behind not only the socialist countries, not only such capitalist countries as Japan and Italy, but even such under-developed countries as Iraq, Venezuela and others. The Congress leaders rarely mention the fact that even after two Five-Year Plans, India's per capita income remains one of the lowest in the world, that the rate of growth has failed to attain even the low targets.

"Further, even this meagre increase is distributed in such a way as to increase the disparity between the rich and the poor. Unemployment figures go on rapidly mounting. Prices have risen to giddy heights—enabling profiteers to amass wealth and inflicting colossal misery on the common man. The big monopolists become ever richer, while the working class is denied adequate wage rise even to compensate for the rise in the cost of living.

"The Congress Government proclaimed that land reforms be carried out with a view to end the concentration of land in a few hands, give lands to the peasants and agricultural workers to ensure justice in the countryside. In actual practice, whatever land reforms have been effected, tardily and half-heartedly, they have brought little benefit to the mass of peasants. More evictions have taken place during Congress rule than in the previous hundred years. The imposition of ceiling has been turned into a farce by fixing it too high and by allowing fictitious transfers.

"The Communist Party is firmly of the opinion that the 14 years of

unbroken Congress rule have shown that the path of development that Congress has chosen cannot ensure an all-sided national advance or eliminate poverty, hunger or unemployment. We must seek an alternative path.

"The crying need of the hour is that the tiller of the soil must be given land, every job-seeker a job and the people food, clothes and other essential necessities at cheap prices. The policies and proposals which this Manifesto outlines are almost the same as mentioned in the previous one. For example, the Communist Party stands for the elimination of foreign monopolies from our national economy and for securing economic independence. There should be drastic curbs on the profits of foreign concerns and their remittance abroad. The Party demands radical agrarian reforms and re-organisation of our agriculture. All land transfers made in recent years must be re-examined and fictitious transfers declared null and void. All loopholes in the existing land legislations, particularly in regard to ceilings, must be forthwith removed and ceilings to eliminate the concentration of land holdings and for benefitting the peasants must be introduced in every state and effectively enforced. Land must be distributed to the landless labourer and the poor peasant.

"The Party stands for a comprehensive programme of rapid industrialisation in which the public sector must at once be given the leading role and the capital-goods industries the pride of place. Small and medium industries must be given every encouragement and assistance by the state and their promotion must form a vital part of national planning. This is essential for arresting the growth of unemployment. There should be a special programme of industrial projects for the industrially backward regions in order to reduce regional disparities in the country's economic development and help the backward regions to catch up with the advanced regions.

"The Party demands nationalisation of banking, general insurance, iron and steel, coal and other mining, oil, sugar, jute, tea plantations under foreign control as well as export and import trade. To allow any sector of our vital and strategic industries to remain in the grips of foreign monopolies is to put the economy of the country to great risks".

War Between China and India (1962)

The border war between India and China broke out on a large scale on 20 October 1962 with a massive Chinese attack. Seven days later, Peking media came out with a bitter ideological attack on Nehru, the Indian bourgeoisie, the twentieth and twentyfirst Congress line of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of India which was described as the "so-called Marxist-Leninist Party" that "trailed behind" the Indian bourgeoisie. The Communist Party of India had already made a total commitment to the nationalist cause. Its National Council met in the last week of October 1962 and adopted a resolution condemning Chinese "aggression". It asked the Indian people to unite behind the Government "in defence of the Motherland." It approved of the acquisition by the Government of India of defence arms "from any country on a commercial basis." S. A. Dange personally assured Jawaharlal Nehru of the complete support of the Communist Party of India in the War. In an article in the party Journal, Dange called India's war against China "a just war" which the Communists were duty bound to support.

Three members of the Central Secretariat of the Communist Party of India who did not agree with the final policy of the Communist Party, resigned in protest. Namboodiripad remained isolated and powerless as a centrist. The police rounded up a large number of dissident Communist leaders. Some of them were threatened by angry Indians with dire consequences if they persisted in their anti-national attitude.

The Dange group took advantage of the disappearance of the leaders and captured the party machinery and newspapers in Bengal and Punjab. The dissident leaders hit back by organising undercover centres to mobilise their followers against the Dange group. Dange went to Moscow to discuss the affairs of the Communist Party of India. The National Council endorsed the actions of S A. Dange, the Party Chairman and his group and denounced the ideological position of the Communist Party of China in the Sino-Soviet conflict. Namboodiripad resigned as General Secretary of the Communist Party of India as well as editor of the New Age. The Chinese denounced the leadership of the Communist Party of India in the most violent terms. Dange was called a Titoist revisionist who had betrayed and split the Communist Party of India by surrendering to the bourgeoisie and its leader Jawaharlal Nehru.

Split in Communist Party

For the next twelve months, the Communist Party of India remained one party only in name because the dissidents from the Communist Party of India were able to set up a separate party which virtually functioned independently as a parallel party. There were certain Communist leaders who wanted to avoid the split. The efforts at mediation failed. It was reported that the new party had been functioning in Delhi since November 1962 as a rival party. A. K. Gopalan and Ramdas were building the All-India parallel centre and Surjeet, Sundarayya and Ramamurti were busy organising their state units. The parallel centres were already running four Weeklies in Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Bengali.

At this time, the "Dange letters" were published. Those letters showed that in 1924, Dange had offered his services as a political agent if the Government would release him. The publication of the Dange letters was an important event. All further negotiations within the two parties became meaningless. When a meeting of the National Council of the Communist Party was held on 10 April 1964, the dissidents walked out of the National Council when the majority turned down their demand for a full ideological debate. The dissidents then moved to form a new Communist Party of India. They were able to assemble 146 delegates to the All-India Indian Communist Convention which met at Tenali in Madras in July 1964.

The dissidents who left the Communist Party of India to form a new Communist Party refused to surrender the independence and sovereignty which Indian Communism had been able to secure for itself after 1956. They were not pro-Chinese. They wanted to take up an independent position in the Sino-Soviet disputes and conflicts, judging each issue on its merits. They did not absolve China of all blame. They also did not adopt the official view of the Government of India. In the final alignment of the leaders between the Communist Party of India and the new party called Communist Party

of India (Marxist) or CPI (M), ideological radicalism was not the dividing line. Rajeswar Rao who was formerly known as Andhra Group's Maoist leader, became a leading theoretician of the Dange group. Ranadive who was previously known as anti-Maoist, became a prominent leader of CPI (M). P. Ramamurti joined CPI (M). Bhupesh Gupta who was known as a vocal critic of A. S. Dange, remained with him. Namboodiripad joined CPI (M) at the last moment. Muzaffar Ahmad also joined CPI (M). Most of the Parliamentarians remained with the Communist Party of India (CPI). More trade unionists than peasant-front workers remained with CPI which also continued to enjoy the loyalty of the leaders who were over 55. The political base of CPI was in the Hindi-speaking North and in Maharashtra, while that of CPI (M) was in Bengal, Madras, Kerala and Andhra Pradesh. The youth fronts in these states went over to the CPI (M). The youth in the Hindi-speaking areas remained mostly with CPI.

As a result of the split in the Communist Party in 1964, the CPI remained a willing camp-follower of Moscow but the CPI (M) proclaimed itself an independent, sovereign body, partisan to neither Moscow nor Peking. In 1969, the third party called the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist), voluntarily attached itself to Peking.

In November 1964, the CPI (M) attributed the split in the Communist Party to the struggle that had been "going on for the last ten years against the repeated attempts to take the Communist Party and the working class movement on to the path of class collaboration. There had been two contradictory lines within the Communist Party of India and those were the line of class struggle and the line of class collaboration. The persistent differences between the two lines were accentuated by the ideological differences within the world Communist movement. The CPI attributed the split primarily not to the external environment but to the cumulative differences between the class protesters and class collaborationists about the strategy and tactics of Indian Communism.

CPI and CPI (M)

1. CPI and CPI (M) differed from each other in certain respects. The CPI saw the state of India as the "organ of the class rule of the national bourgeoisie as a whole". The CPI (M) saw the state as controlled by the upper bourgeoisie in alliance with the major land-owners. Both saw India overtaken by the crisis of capitalist development.

2. The CPI took a mellower view of the capitalist crisis than the CPI (M). The view of the CPI was that capitalist growth in India had strengthened the economic base of nationalism. India had, by and large, proceeded on the line of independent capitalist growth. The view of the CPI(M) was that capitalist development had led to the strengthening of the monopolists, an increasing penetration of foreign capital and to an increasing dependence on foreign imperialist economic aid. The view of the CPI was that the "ushering in of the bourgeois democratic state was an historic advance over the imperialist-bureaucratic rule over our country." The view of the CPI (M) was that the strategy of capitalist development by the Indian monopolists was a threat to the national independence of the country.

3. The view of the CPI (M) was that the major land-owners were the

joint class owners of the Indian state. That was not the view of the CPI. "The national bourgeoisie compromises with the landlords, admits them in the ministries and governmental compositions, especially at the state levels, which allow them to hamper the adoption and implementation of laws and measures of land reforms and further enables them to secure concessions at the cost of the peasantry."

4. The view of the CPI (M) was that the national bourgeoisie was compromising with imperialism both in domestic and foreign policy spheres. The view of the CPI was that the upper bourgeoisie was getting more and more differentiated from the rest and only the monopolist groups and feudal circles represented the main anti-democratic forces of reaction.

5. The view of the CPI was that the first task before India was to complete the national democratic revolution. India had to go through the stage of completing the anti-imperialist, democratic revolution before embarking on the socialist road. The completion of the national democratic revolution was beyond the means of the present Government. What was needed was a national democratic front, "bringing together all the patriotic forces of the country, namely, the working class, entire peasantry including the rich peasantry and the non-monopolist bourgeoisie". The worker-peasant alliance would be the basis and the pivot of the front. Ultimately, the working class would come to occupy the leading position in the alliance. The view of the CPI (M) was that the present stage of the Indian revolution was the agrarian stage "which is directed not only against the landlords and imperialists but also against the Indian bourgeoisie". The objective was to "replace the present anti-democratic and anti-popular Government by a new Government of people's democracy". The people's democratic Government would be a coalition of all democratic, anti-feudal and anti-capitalist forces in the country. Such a Government must be capable of "effectively guaranteeing the rights of the people, of giving land to the peasant gratis, of protecting our national industries against competition of foreign goods and of ensuring the industrialisation of the country, of securing a higher standard of living to the working class, of ridding the people of unemployment and thus placing the country on the wide road of progress, cultural development and independence. The CPI recognised the national bourgeois state of Indit to be a solid achievement towards independence and sought to convert it into a "national democratic state" through a "national democratic front" from above. The CPI(M) considered the state controlled by the bourgeoisie and the landlords to be anti-people and sought its replacement with a people's democracy. This was to be brought about by a people's democratic front built from below on the basis of mass struggles against the present ruling forces. Neither the CPI nor the CPI (M) promised socialism in the immediate future. Both assured sections of the bourgeoisie and landlords a secure position in the new society contemplated by them. The CPI excluded only the monopolists from the national democratic front. The CPI (M) excluded both the upper bourgeoisie and the major landholders from the people's democratic front.

6. The CPI believed that the national democratic state could be achieved through the parliamentary process. To quote, "India's Parliament has provided a forum for the people to intervene in the affairs of the state in a measure and to voice the cause of peace, national freedom and demo-

cracy, to counter imperialist conspiracies and to demand social transformations in favour of the people such as land-reforms, working class rights, curb on monopolies etc." A struggle was growing among the various sections of the national bourgeoisie "to get hold of the parliamentary machine in order to wield power over the budget and other economic measures, laws and policies and to shape them in their own particular group interests."

The monopolists' groups and feudal circles were trying to shift the Parliament and Government policies to the right. The democratic and socialist forces backed the strengthening of the state sector in the economy and its democratic control and parliamentary democracy. For these forces, extra-parliamentary mass struggles were an "effective vehicle of influencing and changing the course of parliamentary policies in favour of the masses and against the monopolists which in effect means the defence of democracy and Parliament itself." The limitations of parliamentary democracy arose from the class role of the bourgeoisie. "It is right reactionary forces which undermine the parliamentary system, both from within and without, by making it an instrument of their narrow class interests and to repress the toiling masses. The Communist Party defends the Parliamentary and democratic institutions and strives to preserve and develop them further, to make democracy full and real for all."

The CPI (M) preferred to make only a tactical use of Parliament. It was sceptical of fundamental structural changes in Indian society resulting from the parliamentary process. That scepticism came from the Indian experience itself. To quote, "There are a large number of people who think that this Government can be replaced by People's Democratic Government by utilising the Parliament ushered in by the new Constitution. Even a liberal would now feel ashamed to maintain, let alone the Communist Party and other democrats and revolutionaries, that this Government and the classes that keep it in power will ever allow us to carry out a fundamental democratic transformation in the country by parliamentary methods alone. Hence, the road that will lead up to freedom and peace, land and bread has to be found elsewhere." As a tactical line, "we must fight the parliamentary elections and elections in every sphere where the broad strata of the people can be mobilised and their interests defended." For fighting elections to Parliament and State Assemblies, the CPI (M) would endeavour to forge an electoral alliance on the basis of a common programme with socialist and leftist democratic parties, groups and progressive individuals. The CPI(M) visualized the possibility of forming non-Congress coalition Governments at the state level.

7. The CPI did not mention the issue of violence in the resolutions and the documents adopted at its Bombay Congress in 1964. Its explicit adherence to the parliamentary methods presumably excluded the deliberate use of violence as a tactical weapon. However, it stressed the need of large-scale mass action. To quote G. Adhikari, "Everything would depend on whether the force of peaceful mass struggle, isolating the ruling class, compels them to surrender or whether they hit back with their armed might at one stage or another. The proletariat and its party must never lose sight of this possibility and it should be prepared for it. Given such a basic preparation, a switchover to non-peaceful methods, when required, should not be difficult". The CPI (M) did not take an essentially different position with regard to

peaceful and non-peaceful methods. "The Communist Party of India strives to achieve the establishment of People's Democracy and Socialist transformation through peaceful means. By developing a powerful mass revolutionary movement, by combining parliamentary and extra-parliamentary forms of struggle, the working class and its allies will try their utmost to overcome the resistance of the forces of reaction and to bring about the transformation through peaceful means. However, it needs to be borne in mind that the ruling classes never relinquish their power voluntarily. They seek to defy the will of the people and seek to reverse it by lawlessness and violence. It is, therefore, necessary for the revolutionary forces to be vigilant and so orientate their work that they can face up to all circumstances, to all twists and turns in the political life of the country".

8. The CPI took a very lenient view of the Congress Party than the CPI (M). The view of the CPI was that the role played by the Congress Party under the leadership of Nehru had consolidated and given mass base to India's independence. The mass base "extends to all classes including large sections of the working class, peasantry, artisans, intellectuals and others." The influence of the Congress Party was "still a very important factor in the political life of the country. The division between the masses that follow the Congress Party and the masses that follow the democratic opposition is the most important division. There are contradictions within the Congress Party between the anti-people forces that dominate the Government and its mass base. The CPI stood for cooperation with the leaders of the Congress mass base. The CPI (M) did not consider the Congress Party as a progressive force. "For, despite the relatively policy declarations of the Congress Party and despite the subjective good intentions of some of its leaders, the fact remains that the Congress Party as a whole is dominated by reactionary elements, the bulk of whom are in it." However, the CPI(M) agreed with the assessment of the CPI of the mass base of the ruling party. "The bulk of the masses who are to be won over to democratic policies and into the democratic front are more or less equally divided into those who follow the Congress Party and those who rallied round the non-Communist opposition parties. Sections of Congressmen are interested in a leftward shift in Government policies."

9. The CPI (M) ruled out a general united front with the Congress Party, but the CPI regarded it as a possibility. The two parties had almost identical attitudes towards the Swatantra Party and Jan Sangh Party and the smaller parties of the left. Cooperation with the rightist parties was ruled out. The socialist parties and groups were considered fit for national or people's democratic fronts although their leaders sometimes pursued reactionary and opportunistic policies.

10. The two parties did not agree regarding their assessment of the foreign policy of India and the defence policy of India. The view of the CPI was that the foreign policy of the Government of India was "in the main, a policy of peace, non-alignment and anti-colonialism. It conforms to the interests of the national bourgeoisie, meets the needs of India's economic development and reflects the sentiments of the mass of the people. It is sometimes vitiated by lapses and compromises, but as a whole the main character of the policy has been generally preserved." For most of the lapses and compromises, the CPI blamed China. The CPI (M) believed that the

domestic policies of the Government were pro-monopolist and pro-imperialist and were influencing its foreign and defence policies also. They found the Government of India surrendering the rights and prerogatives of an independent India to the interests of the imperialists, particularly the United States. Its view was that the Government of India had gone back on its policy of an anti-imperialism and was paying only lip service to non-alignment.

11. Both the Communist parties acknowledged their weakness among the peasantry, particularly among the poor peasants and the landless agricultural workers. The CPI (M) admitted : "But we must note that our trade union front is weak, vast masses of workers remain unorganised, a large number of organised workers remain completely under reformist influence. Our trade union work is permeated with economism. So far as the peasant front is concerned, our weakness is more pronounced. For the last several years, the mass organisations of peasants and agricultural workers were getting more and more weakened. In many places, their existence became only formal. This utter neglect of Kisan front shows that we were victims of revisionism in our understanding of the role of the peasantry in building the democratic front."

12. The CPI claimed a certain measure of strength on the trade union front. In 1968, the CPI decided to convert itself into a mass-base party. On the other hand, the CPI (M) decided to keep its membership restricted only to carefully trained and indoctrinated cadres.

13. Both the parties adopted new constitutions which were almost identical not only in the frame-work of party organisation and functioning, but even in language. The constitution of each Party listed the rights of party members and enumerated "the guiding principles of democratic centralism." Each party was to hold a Congress once every three years and extraordinary Congresses whenever necessary. Each was to have a National Council of not more than 101 members, of whom at least one-fifth were to be new comers. In all essentials, the two parties continued with the constitutional framework of old Communist Party of India.

14. The CPI continued to be officially affiliated with the international Communist movement. Its Congresses were attended by delegates from Communist Parties of foreign countries. Its Bombay Congress in 1964 was attended by Boris Ponomarev as the Head of the delegation of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Invitations came to the CPI from the Communist Parties of foreign countries to send their delegations. The CPI (M) remained officially isolated from the world Communist movement. In 1965, it applied for recognition as a Communist Party to Moscow, but the request was not granted. The CPI (M) did not seek recognition from Peking. However, unofficially the CPI (M) received party documents from a number of countries including the Soviet Union, Poland, Italy, North Vietnam and Peking.

Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist)

The Communist movement in India split for a second time in 1969, partly in response to a call from the Communist Party of China. The Communist Party of China was not satisfied with some of the leaders of the CPI (M) in 1965. The dissatisfaction became strong and vocal in 1966 when

it decided to take part in the general elections to be held in India in 1967. When the CPI (M) joined with the CPI and other non-Communist elements to set up united front Governments in Kerala and West Bengal, the Communist Party of China became furious as it saw in that action a victory for the revisionist elements in the party and a surrender of revolutionary militancy. When the peasant rebellion broke out at Naxalbari in West Bengal in 1967, the Communist Party of China hailed it as the "Spring thunder over India". When the CPI (M) tried to suppress it, the Communist Party of China declared that the CPI (M) was not different from the "Dange renegade revisionist clique". When there was a rebellion of the tribals in the Srikakulam region of Andhra Pradesh, when several Naxalbaries sprouted in Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Kerala and Punjab and when the CPI (M) set itself firmly against such peasant insurgents in 1967, the Communist Party of China called for the formation of a Maoist Communist Party in India.

At the same time in 1967, there developed a serious ideological-political-organisational crisis in the CPI (M). The Central Committee of the CPI(M) adopted a draft thesis in August 1967 and released it for discussion. It was mainly concerned with the position of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union on major ideological issues. The Chinese position was not examined at all. The CPI (M) leadership was prepared to reject the revisionism of the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union but it was not prepared to accept the alternative line of the Communist Party of China. The draft was critical of the intervention by the Communist Party of China in the affairs of the CPI(M) and condemned the Communist revolutionaries who had already received the blessing of the Communist Party of China. The draft met with strong opposition in several state committees of the CPI (M), particularly in Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, Madras, Jammu and Kashmir and Uttar Pradesh. The greatest protest came from Andhra Pradesh. The Communists of Andhra Pradesh agreed with the Chinese assessment of the Indian situation, including the need for an armed struggle.

The dissenters from Andhra Pradesh carried the fight to the CPI (M)'s Burdwan Plenum in May 1968 and rejected the preference of the leadership for parliamentarianism when a large peasant uprising was taking place in Srikakulam and other areas. The Andhra revolutionaries set up a state level coordination committee in September 1968 by which time similar committees had been formed in Jammu and Kashmir, Uttar Pradesh, Punjab and Bihar. In November 1968, the West Bengal committee took the initiative to link all these bodies together in an All-India Coordination Committee of Revolutionaries in the CPI (M). The All-India coordination body changed its name after CPI (M) Burdwan Plenum to All-India Coordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries. (AICCCR). This new body called for the building of a true party through Naxalbari-type struggles, "for revolutions cannot be victorious without a revolutionary party." It also called for the boycott of elections and "revolutionary class battles under the banner of Chairman Mao's thought" leading to a people's democratic revolution.

The theoretical arguments for a new party were provided by Charu Mazumdar, the principal ideologue of the Naxalbari struggle. Charu Mazumdar pointed out that the main contradiction in the countryside is

between the feudal landlords and peasants and only by setting up liberated zones through peasant armed forces under working class leadership can this contradiction be resolved. While the new democratic revolution can succeed only by following the Maoist path, a revolutionary party cannot be built merely with the defectors from the two Communist Parties. Basically, "such a party will be formed with the youth of the working class, the peasantry and the toiling middle class who not only accept the thought of Chairman Mao but also apply the same in their own lives, spread and propagate it among the broad masses and build basis for armed struggle in the countryside. Such a party will not only be a revolutionary party, but it will be at the same time the people's armed force and the people's state power.

In June 1968, Charu Mazumdar declared that the Naxalbari struggle was not for land or crops but for the seizure of political power. Charu Mazumdar also wrote that the revolutionary cadres must work secretly among the peasants, avoiding open propaganda and demonstrations. The secret organisation of these cadres is to become the party of the future. The cadres can build revolutionary bases among the peasants through successful application of four weapons viz., class analysis, investigation, study and class struggle.

Serious differences arose between the district committee and the State committee of the CPI (M) in Andhra Pradesh over the basic question of armed struggle and the form it should take and how to train the Girijan tribals of Srikakulam for it. In September 1968, the district committee unanimously decided in favour of armed struggle for Srikakulam. The committee also decided to join the All-India Coordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries. Armed struggle began in Srikakulam towards the end of 1968. In February 1969, the All-India Coordination Committee of the Communist Revolutionaries decided to start a new Communist Party. It was declared that the revolutionary situation in India was excellent, but "without a revolutionary party there can be no revolutionary discipline and without revolutionary discipline, the struggle cannot be raised to a higher level." The All-India Coordination Committee of Communist Revolutionaries converted itself into the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) on 22 April 1969 and the party was formally launched on 1 May at a rally in Calcutta. In July 1969 the Communist Party of China conferred legitimacy on the CPI (ML) by publishing a summary of its political resolution.

It was stated in the political resolution that the principal contradiction in Indian society is between feudalism and the peasant masses. The strategic goal is a people's democratic revolution, "the main content of which is the agrarian revolution, the abolition of feudalism in the countryside." The revolution is to be won through an alliance of the working class with the poor and landless peasants and the middle level peasants. The working class is to lead the alliance towards the seizure of power through armed struggle. A revolutionary front of all revolutionaries and revolutionary classes is to be built on the basis of the worker-peasant alliance. Only through a people's war can a weak revolutionary force win over an apparently powerful enemy. The basic tactic of the peasant struggle is to be guerrilla warfare. The main task of the party is to rally all revolutionary classes around the basic programme of agrarian reforms. The Indian revolution will have to fight both American imperialism and Soviet social imperialism. The party will firmly

reject parliamentarianism and adhere to armed revolution. It will be rural-based so that it can rouse the peasantry to wage guerrilla war, unfold the agrarian revolution, build liberated rural bases, use the countryside to encircle the cities and finally capture the cities. It will be a secret and underground party, keeping its main cadre underground. It will utilise all possible legal opportunities for struggle but it will not function openly under any circumstances. The party will try to integrate revolutionary theory and practice, forge class links with the masses and practise criticism and self-criticism.

There were differences among the leaders of the CPI (ML) over certain issues. The question raised was whether the guerrilla warfare was to be the only form of struggle or not. The view that prevailed was that guerrilla warfare alone can mobilise the poor peasants and establish their leadership of the CPI(ML). Charu Mazumdar also formulated the concept of "annihilation of class enemies". In 1970, Charu Mazumdar introduced two important changes in his tactics of liquidation. The revolutionaries should not use the fire-arms and depend mostly on conventional weapons, even "bare hands". If guerrilla groups start their liquidation campaign with conventional weapons, then the landlords and poor peasantry will come forward to participate in the liquidation programme with bare hands. They will avenge themselves on their class enemy and develop un-bounded revolutionary zeal. The second change was a contraction of the guerrilla squad's operational base. The annihilation programme should be carried out on the basis of "one area, one unit, one squad".

The Government took strong action against the workers of the CPI (ML) and their activities were crushed with a heavy hand both in West Bengal and in Andhra Pradesh. When that happened, the Naxalites concentrated on Calcutta. The youth of Calcutta took up the call of Charu Mazumdar to boycott examinations, destroy books, beat up teachers and proctors, raid schools, colleges and universities, defile and even pull down portraits and statues of national heroes like Mahatma Gandhi, Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar and Vivekananda, smash science laboratories, harass motorists and to do everything possible to defy the authority of the Government. They wrote threatening letters to doctors, moneylenders, black-marketeers and profiteers and sometimes waylaid and murdered them. They also maimed and killed the cadres of the CPI (M). A large number of boys and girls of well-to-do families left their colleges and universities in Delhi, Lucknow, Patna, Banaras and Allahabad to join the peasants in their armed struggle. In Calcutta, even the teenagers joined the annihilation campaigns and sometimes were themselves killed. It is said that there were as many as 1,500 murders in the city of Calcutta alone in 1970. However, the Government took strong action and one by one the Naxalites were liquidated in all parts of India. Many of them left the CPI (ML) as they did not agree with the tactics of Charu Mazumdar for the annihilation of the class enemy.

Charu Mazumdar died on 28 June 1972 and the CPI (ML) broke up into several factions. When the national Emergency was declared on 26 June 1975, the CPI (ML) was banned. At present, it has very little influence in Indian politics.

It is true that the revolutionaries of the CPI (ML) failed, but they introduced the concept of armed peasant guerrilla warfare in India's opera-

tional vocabulary. They also showed how urban guerrilla terrorism by a relatively small number of people can create difficult, complicated and stubborn problems for the Indian political and social system. They also showed that the state was weak when there was organised defiance of its authority by peasants and middle class youth. Moreover, the fact that thousands of poor peasants over widely dispersed area could be mobilised for guerrilla warfare even for a brief period, shook the foundation of the belief that the Indian peasant is too passive and too resigned to his fate to seek redress through violent action.

Communist Party of India Since 1967

When the general elections were held in 1967, the Communist Party of India issued its Election Manifesto in which it outlined the programme for immediate measures. The programme included total elimination of foreign monopolies, annulment of all collaboration agreements, taking over by the state of all foreign trade, effective measures to curb the monopolists and to break up the 75 monopoly houses, replacement of the Fourth Plan by a people's plan, nationalisation of banks, mopping up the accumulated wealth of the monopolists and former princes, abolition of land revenue, overhauling the existing tax structure, re-organisation of the public sector, assurance of minimum need-based wage and the enforcement of land reforms. The party also advocated the abolition of the emergency powers of the President and his power to dismiss a state Government so long as the latter enjoyed the confidence of the legislature. The institutions of the Governor and the Upper Houses in the states were to be abolished.

When the elections were held in 1971, the Communist Party of India issued a manifesto in which it stated that the Constitution must be amended to place Parliament's supremacy and the will of the people beyond all challenge by the judiciary, including the Supreme Court of India. The Constitution should also be amended to make it obligatory on the part of the judiciary "to interpret legislation for social and economic changes, not for restricting their scope or for protecting the vested interests affected by them but for the promotion of social justice and progress." The judiciary must be guided by the Preamble and the Directive Principles of State Policy while interpreting such measures. The party also advocated the abolition of the posts of the Governors and the Upper Houses of legislatures both at the Centre and the States. During the Emergency, the Communist Party of India supported the Congress Party headed by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi.

When the elections were held in 1977, the Communist Party of India issued a manifesto in which it stated that while it had supported the declaration of Emergency in June 1975 and backed 20-point programme of the Government, after the initial period of some achievements, the emergency powers came to be more and more misused against the working class, the peasantry, the common people and the democratic forces. The parliamentary democratic system and institutions were undermined and concessions "to vested interests went hand in hand with coercive sterilization, demolition of the dwelling houses of the poor, denial of workers' long standing right to bonus and impounding of their dearness allowance. Land reforms were shelved and the 20-point programme was put in the background. Authoritarian trends and practices in the conduct of the Government and also otherwise

in the affairs of the state began to grow. Persistent efforts were made to encourage extra-constitutional methods and centres of political power. The manifesto demanded that the Emergency should be lifted and press censorship ended. The MISA and the Prevention of Publication of Objectionable Matter Act should be rescinded. The rights of the workers of the trade unions should be fully recognized by the Government. Weavers should get the spinning yarn at cheap rates. The age of voting should be lowered to 18 years. Equal rights should be given to men and women. Untouchability must be abolished. Laws should be passed for the welfare of the farmers or tenants, landlords, labourers, Adivasis or Scheduled Tribes. Adequate facilities should be given to farmers for loan, irrigation, seeds and manure. The party called upon the voters to give a clear mandate in favour of "progressive and democratic forces" and defeat the "reactionaries". When the elections were held in March 1977, the Communist Party of India was able to secure only seven seats out of 542 seats in the Lok Sabha. Previously, it had 24 seats.

On the eve of the elections to Lok Sabha to be held in January 1980 the Communist Party of India issued its election manifesto on 2 November 1979. It called upon the voters to defeat both the Janata Party and Congress (I). The party put forward a minimum programme in which emphasis was put on land reforms and improvement of the condition of the agricultural workers and the tilling peasantry. The rights and interests of the working class were to be protected. Prices should be reduced and the people should be assured of the supply of essential commodities. The minorities should be protected. The people were asked to vote against communalism and authoritarianism. When the elections were held in January 1980, the Communist Party of India won ten seats.

The Communist Party of India has accepted the new Soviet Party thesis and its Constitution now provides that the Communist Party of India "strives to achieve full democracy and socialism by peaceful means. It considers that by developing a powerful mass movement, by winning a majority in Parliament and by backing it with mass sanctions, the working class and its allies can overcome the resistance of the forces of reaction and ensure that Parliament becomes an instrument of the people's will for effecting fundamental changes in the economic, social and state structure."

Communist Party of India (M) Since 1967

When the general elections were held in 1967, the CPI (M) issued its Election Manifesto in which it was stated that the CPI(M) is the only party which stands firmly and consistently for socialism. It rejects the Communist Party's commitment to the "parliamentary road to socialism." It aims at the socialisation of the means of production. It is in the proletarian state alone that the exploitation of man by man can be abolished and the problem of poverty can be solved. The road to socialism can be opened only through the establishment of a State of People's democracy led by the working class and replacing the present bourgeois state. That can be achieved only by developing determined mass struggles on the basis of growing unity and consciousness of the people. The party believes in and advocates Bandhs, Gheraoes and students' struggle. It was stated in the manifesto that the "mighty Bengal Bandhs, the Kerala, Bihar and U.P. Bandhs have set the pace for the new movement. Millions have participated in these struggles

and braved the firing squads of the police to defend their livelihoods and liberties. These have been followed by the mighty wave of students' struggles which the Government seeks to put down by sheer terror. There have been big struggles of the working class, salaried employees and finally the employees of the Government. Never before since Independence, India witnessed such mighty struggles". The party called upon the people to rout the Congress and endorse the electoral programme of the party which alone showed a way out of the present critical situation.

The CPI (M) also issued a manifesto in 1971. It maintained that the courts must function as the instruments of the people's will and not as instrument opposing popular progress. The people should have complete freedom to remove those judges who hold up the march of progress. The party advocated the taking over of landlords' lands and their free distribution among agricultural labour and poor peasants, cancellation of the debts of peasants, agricultural workers and small artisns, equitble distribution of food to the people of urban and rural areas, state trading in foodgrains and the compulsory procurement of the entire surplus of the produce of landlords and rich peasants. The party advocated reduction in defence expenditure, abolition of land tax, irrigation cess and other cesses and surcharges on uneconomic holdings. No further aid should be got from the United States and a moratorium should be put on all foreign payments. All foreign trade should be nationalised. All foreign capital in plantations, mining, refineries, industry, shipping and trade should be taken over. The party stood for an independent foreign policy based on opposition to imperialism, colonialism and neo-colonialism. It advocated a policy of co-existence and friendship with the peace-loving countries. The connection with Britain must be broken. The dispute with China should be settled in a peaceful manner and friendly relations should be established. The CPI (M) pledged itself to take new initiatives "to organise common struggles of all the anti-imperialist countries, particularly those of Asia and Africa against the increasing penetration of the American, West German, Japanese and other imperial powers in the economy, political life, cultural activities and in the military affairs of the newly independent countries."

When the elections were held in 1977, the CPI(M) issued a manifesto in which it was claimed that the Emergency had taken from the people all their rights. It had led to repression and arrest of thousands of people, a censored and controlled press, a drive for forcible sterilisation under the pressure of the World Bank, attacks on the rights of the working class and increasing misery and greater unemployment among the masses. It asked the people to vote against the "one party dictatorship of the Congress." It expressed regret that the CPI, by lending support to the Emergency and the Forty-second Amendment of the Constitution, was enabling the Congress to "institutionalize the emergency powers".

The CPI (M) advocated the withdrawal of the Emergency, release of all political prisoners and withdrawal of warrants against them. It advocated the deletion of the new provisions introduced in the Constitution by the Forty-Second Amendment in 1976. It demanded the withdrawal of the MISA and the Press Objectionable Matter Act. It also advocated the take-over of foreign capital, moratorium on foreign debt payments, nationalisation of monopoly houses, nationalisation of sugar, textile, jute, cement and drug

industries, the take-over of foreign trade, ending of corruption and bureaucratism in public sector undertakings, abolition of landlordism, minimum wage of Rs. 8 per day to agricultural labourers, cancellation of debts of peasants, landless labourers and the rural poor. Prices should be brought down drastically. Taxes must be reduced. The right to work should be made a fundamental right under the Constitution. There should be compulsory and free education up to the age of 14.

For the elections held in January 1980, the CPI (M) released its election manifesto on 25 September 1979. In its manifesto, the party demanded that the Constitution should be so amended as to give a large measure of autonomy to the states. The number of items in the Concurrent List should be reduced in the Constitution. The residuary powers should be given to the states. The emergency provisions in the Constitution should be abrogated. The right to work must be made a fundamental right. The grip of the big landlords should be eliminated. India should have an independent policy in the field of nuclear explosion. There should be a struggle against the domination of the World Bank. The foreign monopoly concerns should be nationalised. A moratorium on foreign debt payments must be put immediately. The Indian monopoly concerns should be nationalised. There should be a drastic reduction in the prices of necessaries of life and their supply must be guaranteed. Fair price must be guaranteed for agricultural produce and cheap credit and subsidised inputs should be given to the farmers. There must be a need-based minimum wage for the working class. There must be bonus for all. There must be no wage freeze, lock-outs, lay-offs and closure of mills. All closed mills and concerns should be taken over by the Government. Full trade union rights should be given to the employees of the Central and State Governments. There must be free education up to secondary stage in all states. There must not be an indiscriminate import of foreign technology, particularly from the multinationals. The policy of non--alignment was an integral part of the struggle for freedom, peace, democracy and socialism.

When the elections were held in January 1980, the CPI (M)) won 35 seats. When elections were held to the State Assemblies in the same year, the CPI (M) was again victorious and formed its own Government in West Bengal in 1980 as it had done in 1977.

About the Communist movement in India, Professor Bhabani Sen Gupta writes that the Communists in India are pitted against a state and a political sytsem created, devised and evolved by the bourgeoisie to which they could make little positive contribution. The problem which has baffled them all these years is whether they should work within the political system and use its institutions and instruments to gradually change its qualitative character or whether they should try to overthrow the system and replace it with another based on a radical realignment of productive relationships. The united Communist Party of India started with the tactics of overthrowing it but ultimately adopted the tactics of working within it. The split of the Communists into three factions enables them to try the three different tactics at the same time. The CPI is working with the progressive bourgeoisie so that ultimately it can take over the system. The programme of the CPI(M) is to wreck the existing system from within. The CPI (ML) tries to overthrow the system by violent means. The division of the Communists has weakened

as well as strengthened the Communist movement. In terms of mobilisation, fresh strategic and tactical thinking and recruitment of new cadres, the Communist Party has been strengthened rather than weakened.

Moreover, the Communist experience in West Bengal and Kerala shows that it is far easier for the Communists to expand and consolidate their influence on the masses, especially in the countryside, by using the power of the Government than by acting in opposition to the authority of the state. This strengthens the view that parliamentarianism has still a revolutionary role to play in India in case the Communists do not act like the bourgeoisie in the Parliament and State Legislatures. The CPI and the CPI (M) have more or less similar social basis. They will have to agree to treat each other as equals if they are to live in a relationship of friendly cooperation. (Communism in Indian Politics, pp. 401, 425, 456).

SUGGESTED READINGS

Abid Ali : *The Indian Communists*, 1965.

Adhikari, G. (Ed.) : *Documents on the History of the Communist Party of India*, New Delhi, 1974.

Balram, N.E. : *A Short History of Communist Party of India*, 1967.

Bandyopadhyaya, Jayantuga : *Indian Nationalism Versus International Communism*, Calcutta, 1966.

Chowdhry, S.R. : *Leftist Movements in India.*

Dutta, R. Palme : *Modern India.*

Ghose, Sankar : *Socialism and Communism in India*, Bombay, 1971.

Haithcox, J.P. : *Communism and Nationalism in India*, Bombay, 1971.

Irani, C.R. : *Communism in Bengal.*

Kautsky, John H. : *Moscow and the Communist Party of India*, 1956.

Kothari, Rajani : *Politics in India*, Delhi, 1970.

Limaye, Madhu : *Communist Party : Facts and Fiction*, Hyderabad, 1951.

Masani, M.R. : *The Communist Party of India*, Bombay, 1964.

Mohan Ram : *Maoism in India*, New Delhi, Vikas, 1971.

Muzaffar Ahmad : *The Communist Party of India and Its Formation Abroad*, Calcutta, 1962.

Nair : *How Communists Came to Power ?*

Overstreet, G.D. and Marshall Windmiller : *Communism in India*, 1959.

Petri, David : *Communism in India* (1924-27).

Ranga N.G. : *Kisans and Communists.*

Sen Gupta, Bhabani : *Communism in Indian Politics*, New Delhi, 1978.

Tagore, S. : *Historical Development of the Communist Party in India*, Calcutta, 1944.

CHAPTER XXV

The Socialist Movement and Thought in India

Many Indian leaders showed interest in socialism from time to time. Raja Ram Mohan Roy discussed with Robert Owen the philosophy of socialism. Dadabhai Naoroji worked in close collaboration with the pioneers of socialism in Britain and Hyndman was one of his closest friends. Dadabhai Naoroji and Karl Marx worked more or less at the same time in the British Museum. In his articles contributed to the Indu Prakash in 1893, Aurobindo criticised the middle class orientation of the Indian National Congress and pleaded for the betterment of the conditions of the proletariat. In his articles written in 1908, Tilak mentioned the Russian Nihilists. B. C. Pal toyed with the idea of what he called "Pagan socialism" or "Hindu socialism". Annie Besant toyed with the idea of what she called "aristocratic socialism". To quote from her book entitled "Future Socialism", "A Democratic Socialism controlled by majority votes, guided by numbers, can never succeed. A truly aristocratic socialism, controlled by duty, guided by wisdom, is the next step upwards in civilisation".

In 1921-23, M. N. Roy wrote two books entitled "India in Transition" and "Indian Problem" in which he criticized the bourgeois domination of the Indian National Congress. In his Presidential address at the Gaya session of the Indian National Congress, C. R. Das referred to the Russian Revolution of 1917 but he did not show any sympathy for it. However, he helped in building up a trade union movement in India. In 1926, Motilal Nehru and Jawaharlal Nehru visited the Soviet Union and Jawahar-Lal Nehru wrote a small book entitled "Soviet Russia".

Lala Lajpat Rai presided over the first Indian Trade Union Congress in 1920. He made a systematic and serious attempt to understand, analyse and differentiate traditional orthodox Marxism from what could be applicable to India. The Punjab Socialist Party founded in the 1930's owed its intellectual origins to the thought and personality of Lala Lajpat Rai and consisted of his former disciples, friends and admirers. The objects of the Punjab Socialist Party were defined as "the establishment of a new economic order in which the worker will be entitled to the full reward for his labour and there will be no exploitation of one class by another". Again, "In the new economic order which we shall strive to establish, instruments of production, as far as possible, will be owned by the people as a whole". The immediate aim of the Party was the nationalisation of land. It was maintained that nationalisation is the only means of inspiring the peasant with hope and by increasing production, it will be an important means of assuring a larger income to the agricultural community. It was also proposed to nationalise "such large manufacturing industries as can with advantage be transferred to the community taking in view the existing political and economic conditions of the country".

However, nationalisation of the industries controlled by Indians was not contemplated. It was proclaimed that a united Indian nation can be created on an economic basis alone and hence the effort was to unite the masses of workers of all communities irrespective of their religious faiths under the same banner and to start a war against religious prejudices which were anti-national in their character.

In 1926, the U.P. Provincial Congress Committee drew up a mild socialist programme. It was declared that there should be no intermediaries between the state and the cultivators. In 1929, at a metting held at Bombay, the All-India Congress Committee passed a resolution saying, "In the opinion of this Committee, the great poverty and misery of the Indian people are due not only to the foreign exploitation of India but also to the economic structure of society which the other rulers support so that their exploitation may continue. In order therefore to remove this poverty and misery and to ameliorate the condition of the Indian masses, it is essential to make revolutionary changes in the present economic and social structure of society and to remove the gross inequalities". In 1929, Jawahar Lal Nehru presided over the Indian Trade Union Congress and also the Lahore session of the Indian National Congress. In his speech, Jawaharlal Nehru declared, "I must frankly confess that I am a socialist and a republican, and am no believer in kings and princes or in the order which produces the modern kings of industry who have greater power over the lives and fortunes of men than even the kings of old and whose methods are as predatory as those of the old feudal aristocracy." At its Karachi session in March 1931, the Indian National Congress passed a resolution on Fundamental Rights and Economic Policy saying, "The state shall own or control key industries and services, mineral resources, railways, waterways, shipping and other means of public transport". The Bihar Socialist Party was founded in 1931 and the Bombay Socialist group was organised in 1934.

The foundation of the Congress Socialist Party in May 1934 was an important step in the development of socialism in India. The Congress Socialist Party "developed out of the experience of the Indian people struggling for freedom. Its very formation was a protest and revolt against the line the Third International pursued in India". The Socialists sought to stop the demoralising drift towards constitutionalism and compromise which had made itself felt in Congress politics since the unsuccessful conclusion of the Civil Disobedience movement of 1932-33. Due to the pioneering work of the Party, since the depressing days of 1934 when Civil Disobedience had to be called off and all through the upsurge of parliamentarianism, a vigorous left wing had developed in the Congress which even penetrated the ranks of the leadership.

Jayaprakash Narayan was in the Nasik Jail and alongwith him were Achyut Patwardhan, Ashoka Mehta, N. G. Gorey, S. M. Joshi, Minoo Masani and Prof. M. L. Dantwala. It was in the Nasik Jail that the blueprints of the Congress Socialist Party were worked out. Jayaprakash Narayan was the moving spirit behind the whole idea and was to be the principal organiser of the movement. After his release from Nasik Jail, he organised the All-India Congress Socialist Conference at Patna on 17 May, 1934 under the Presidentship of Acharya Narendra Deva of Kashi Vidyapeeth. It was

resolved at the Conference that all power should be transferred to the producing masses. The economic life of the country should be planned and controlled by the state. The key principal industries should be socialised. There should be state monopoly of foreign trade. The princes, landlords and all other classes of exploiters should be eliminated. Land should be redistributed among the peasants. The state should encourage and promote cooperative and collective farming with a view to the ultimate collectivization of all agriculture in the country. The debts of the peasants and workers should be liquidated. There should be adult franchise on functional basis.

The elder leadership of the Congress dissociated itself from the philosophy and the movement of the new party and the Working Committee of the Indian National Congress issued the following statement on 18 June 1934 : "Whilst the Working Committee welcomes the formation of groups representing different schools of thought, it is necessary in view of the loose talk about confiscation of private property and necessity of class war to remind Congressmen that the Karachi Resolution neither contemplates confiscation of private property nor advocacy of class war. The Working Committee is further of the opinion that confiscation and class war are contrary to the Congress creed of non-violence".

The next open session of All-India Socialist Conference was held at Bombay on 21 October, 1934. It was at that session that the All-India Congress Socialist Party was formally inaugurated. Jayaprakash Narayan was the General Secretary of the Congress Socialist Party and his colleagues were Acharya Narendra Deva, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, Kamla Devi Chattopadhyaya, Yusuf Meherally, Minoo Masani, S. M. Joshi and others. There were also young people like E.M.S. Namboodiripad, P. Ramamurthy, Sundarayya and others who later on left the Congress Socialist Party and joined the Communist Party.

While explaining the objectives of the Congress Socialist Party, Jayaprakash Narayan said, "If the ultimate objective is to make the masses politically and economically free, to give them unfettered opportunity for development, then, socialism becomes a goal to which one must irresistibly be drawn. If again the objective is to take hold of the chaotic and conflicting forces of society and to fashion the latter according to the ideal of utmost social good and to harness all conscious directives of human intelligence in the service of the commonwealth, then, again socialism becomes an inescapable destination". He justified the establishment of the Socialist Party within the Congress on the ground that the present programme of the Congress was short of the socialistic ideas. To quote him, "Far from effecting revolution in it, it (Congress) leaves the economic structure of society intact. It leaves the means of production in the hands of private individuals except in the sphere of key industries. The entire economic organisation based as it is on the exploitation of the poor and middle classes is preserved. This is not economic freedom. The preamble and substance of the Karachi Resolution are at wide variance with each other. What we endeavour to do is to remove this variance and bring them close together".

The Congress Socialist Party adopted at Bombay a 15-Point programme which included the repudiation of the public debt of India, transfer of all

power to producing masses, planned development of the economic life of the country by the state, socialisation of the key industries, state monopoly of foreign trade, cooperative and collective farming, organisation of co-operatives for production, distribution and credit and elimination of princes and landlords without compensation. The members of the Congress Socialist Party criticized the leadership of the Congress but professed loyalty to the organisation. In the words of Acharya Narendra Deva, their object was "to rususcitate and reinvigorate the Congress" and to draw into it the mass of workers and peasants in order to widen the base of the anti-imperialist front. They criticised Mahatma Gandhi and his non-violence, his ethical approach to politics and his theory of trusteeship.

In his Presidential address at the Bengal Congress Socialist Party Conference held in 1935, Jayaprakash Narayan defined the task of his Party within the Congress in these words: "Our work within the Congress is governed by the policy of developing it into a true anti-imperialist body. It is not our purpose, as sometimes it has been misunderstood to be, to convert the whole Congress into a full-fledged Socialist Party. All we seek to do is to change the content and policy of that organisation, that it comes truly to represent the masses having the object of emancipating them both from the foreign power and native system of exploitation". He also declared that the purpose of his party was not to disrupt the Congress but to organise the anti-imperialist elements within the Congress in such a way that a split within the Congress would become inevitable and such a split would be a ripening consolidation of anti-imperialist forces. He also wanted to develop the Congress in relation to its internal organisation and constitution.

There were bound to be clashes between the members of the Congress Socialist Party and the old members of the Congress. They differed on the question of the Government of India Act, 1935, the formation of ministries by the Congress in 1937, the organisation of Kisan Sabhas and agitation for agrarian reforms, the release of political detenus and agitation in the Indian states. There were bitter controversies in which the Congress leadership was severely criticised. Jayaprakash went to the extent of saying, "Gandhism has played its part. It cannot carry us further and hence we must march and be guided by the ideals of socialism". The leaders of the Congress Socialist Party did not realise the difficulties of the Congress Party which had to fight both against the British Government and the Muslim League and that could not be done without discipline in the Congress Socialist Party itself.

It is true that Jawaharlal Nehru was ideologically the closest to the Congress Socialist Party. He was in jail when the new party was formed. When he became the Congress President, he included Jayaprakash Narayan, Acharya Narendra Deva and Achyut Patwardhan in the Congress Working Committee. Mahatma Gandhi was against the Congress Socialist Party and he made it clear that if the Congress Socialist Party gained ascendancy in the Congress, he would not remain in the Congress. He did not approve of class war, expropriation and violence. Subhas Chandra Bose asked Jawaharlal Nehru to be firm with the Congress establishment but Nehru was not prepared to defy Gandhiji or break away from the Congress. Mahatma Gandhi offered again and again to step down if his ideas were

not acceptable to the All-India Congress Committee. In October 1939, Mahatma Gandhi wrote to Nehru, "I must not lead if I cannot carry all with me. There should be no divided counsels among the members of the Working Committee. I feel you should take full charge and lead the country, leaving me free to voice my opinion." Nehru was not prepared to allow Mahatma Gandhi to give up the leadership of the Congress. He was not unaware of his own limitations. He could rouse the masses and inspire the intelligentsia but he was not an expert in party management.

Whatever the differences between the Congress Socialist Party and the leadership of the Indian National Congress, there was no intention to carry the opposition to the breaking point. The leaders of the Congress Socialist Party knew full well that they could not realise their programme unless and until the British were driven out of India and that could be done only by the Indian National Congress. The Congress Socialist Party got a lot of support from the youth, the industrial labour and the peasantry, but it was still in a minority. It was not a homogeneous group. It consisted of Marxists like Jayaprakash Narayan and Narendra Deva, Socialist Democrats like Asoka Mehta and M. R. Masani, Gandhians like Patwardhan and populists like Ram Manohar Lohia. It is true that the Congress Socialist Patry was not able to have its own way on many important issues, but it certainly succeeded in giving radical orientation to the Congress policies in certain respects. The World War II and the breach with the Government brought the Congress Socialists nearer to Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress leadership. Both the Congress leaders and the Congress Socialists worked against the Government during the Quit India movement. Jayaprakash Narayan escaped from Hazaribagh jail and joined the ranks of the freedom fighters. Achyut Patwardhan, Aruna Asaf Ali, Dr. Lohia, Sucheta Kriplani and others were operating under the name of the underground All-India Congress Committee and trying to widen the scope of the mass struggle. When Jayaprakash Narayan came out of jail, he declared that only armed resistance could achieve the objectives. He organised squads which operated in Bihar. Nepal was used as a base of operations. Ultimately, both Jayaprakash Narayan and Lohia were arrested.

The Congress Socialists were always keen to consolidate all leftist forces in the country and hence the Congress Socialist Party opened its doors to the Communists in 1936. The Communist Party was an illegal party at that time and its leaders were happy to get a chance of functioning openly through the Congress Socialist Party and the Indian National Congress. The Communists created trouble for the leaders of the Congress Socialist Party and hence were expelled from it in 1940. However, they took away with them the Southern branches of the Congress Socialist Party. If the Communists had not been expelled in 1940, they would have created more trouble. Paul Rose writes in "Socialism in Southern India", "Ideologically there was little to distinguish the Congress Socialist Party from the Communist Party of India. The differences were mainly tactical, resulting from the Communist Party affiliation to the Comintern and the Comintern line at that time. The Congress Socialist Party was designed as a vehicle to carry socialism into the national movement represented by the Congress with the object not of converting the Congress but of splitting it". The differences between the Congress Socialist Party and the Communist Party

of India were not merely tactical. Those were mainly ideological and mostly significant. Those differences were not very much played up by either the Socialist Party or the Communist Party in the early periods of their rise. In fact those were concealed although they were there consciously or unconsciously. Emphasis was not put on those differences in the interests of leftist unity.

In March 1948, at the Nasik Convention, the Congress Socialists decided to leave the Congress because the leadership of the Congress forbade all inner groupings within that organisation. The new party came to be known as the Socialist Party of India. After the general elections of 1952, the Socialist Party of India and Krishak Mazdoor Praja Party led by J. B. Kriplani decided to merge and the same was done in September 1952 and the new party came to be known as the Praja Socialist Party.

The National Executive of the Praja Socialist Party at its meeting in Bombay on 16 October, 1959 outlined a 12-Point programme for India. It stood for intensification of agricultural and industrial production, equitable distribution and democratic decentralisation. Its basic political and economic philosophy was to bring about a reconciliation and synthesis of nationalism, secularism and democratic decentralisation.

In 1962, the Praja Socialist Party issued an Elecetion Manifesto in which it highlighted three issues which needed to be tackled without any delay. Those were "concentration of wealth and economic power in a few hands, the problem of unemployment and the need for keeping inflationary forces in check."

On 9 August, 1971, the three Socialist Parties in the country merged to form one party known as the Socialist Party. This was done before the elections to the State Assemblies in February 1972. However, there were defections of a few comrades. The Chairman of the Party was George Fernandes with Surendra Mohan as General Secretary. Raj Narain led the faction. The Socialist Party was merged in the Janata Party in 1977 and also joined the Janata Government. After the fall of the Janata Government in 1979, some of the socialist members remained in the Janata Party and some joined the Lok Dal.

The Socialist leadership in India was influenced a great deal by Karl Marx, Engels and Lenin but they were not swayed away completely by Marxist thought and dogma. Various aspects of Marxism attracted various Marxist leaders. Socialist leadership in India was not doctrinaire and did not follow blindly Marxism but the influence of Marx was always there. Acharya Narendra Deva believed that true Marxism was not a dogma. It was a dynamic concept in which changes were inevitable with the change in circumstances. He was not in favour of Bernstein Revisionism. However, some amount of revisionism was both necessary and desirable. Asoka Mehta did not attach importance to the Marxian concept of dialectical materialism. His criticism of Marxism is that the great adventure of Marxian socialism has ended in a flight from freedom into forgetfulness. To quote him, "The reasons why Marx's dream took on nightmarish shapes are to be traced to his stubborn indifference to certain sociological and psychological realities. The proletariat, through the long process of scrip-

ping through its infusion with dialectical philosophy, ends very nearly as the terrible simplificateur. The pilgrimage of freedom ends in a prison-house of its principles."

Gandhiji also influenced the socialist movement and thought in India. At the Nasik Conference held in March 1948, Jayaprakash Narayan observed, "There are many things that Mahatma Gandhi taught us. But the greatest thing he taught was that means are ends, that evil means can never lead to good ends and that fair ends require fair means. Some of us may have been sceptical of this truth but recent world events and events at home have convinced me that nothing but good means will enable us to reach the goal of a good society which is socialism." Again, "Is everything due to economic inequality? Is capitalism the only evil? Can we entirely depend upon class struggle? I do not think so. Economic approach cannot be the only approach. We have been preaching all this all these years. I feel that our approach has a limited appeal. If ours was the only method, class struggle the only weapon, economic approach the only attitude, then India would not have been partitioned." In 1952, Jayaprakash Narayan published a pamphlet entitled "Political Trends" in which he observed, "There is unfortunately mutual suspicion today between the forces of democratic socialism and of Gandhism. This is largely due to lack of objectivity on both sides. The names of Marx and Gandhi often act as barriers and the issue of violence—even theoretical violence—confuses all other issues".

Acharya Narendra Deva was also attracted by the Satyagraha method of Gandhiji. His view is that Satyagraha is an essential right in a democratic form of Government. If violence is to be checked, it is necessary that the right of Satyagraha is not snatched away from the people. Satyagraha is permissible even after Independence. It is the proper method to remove the lethargy of the authorities and to make them conscious of their duties.

Dr. Lohia was also influenced by certain views and methods of Gandhiji which he believed could profitably be introduced into Indian socialism. To quote him, "A separate creed of Gandhism would perhaps not be of much use to the world. Socialism is already on the world stage. The doctrine is still open. That gives us hope and if some of these ideas from Gandhiji's life and action can be woven into a consistent cloth of socialism, the new civilisation may emerge and mankind may hope for an age of peace and decent living". Again, "It is not necessary for a people suffering from starvation or large-scale dismissals to depend on Parliament or to wait expectantly for another general election. They have this priceless, matchless weapon of civil disobedience in their hands. When injustice and oppression go beyond bearable bounds, when constitutional methods have proved incapable of achieving redress, it should be open for the people to violate unjust laws and wrongs and injustices that are inflicted upon them. To violate laws, to court imprisonment, to invite punishment by authority even to the extent of death is the only satisfactory way of effecting change. In any case this is the specific contribution of the political action which Gandhiji made". Again, "It may well be that Mahatma Gandhi tended to over-emphasize the individual and under-emphasize the environment. Let it also be realised that socialism has tended to over-em-

phasize the environment and under-emphasize the individual. If a logical system of thought were to be devised, equal emphasis would have to be laid on both, for man is both ends and means. The need today is to combine the sage and the saint".

Asoka Mehta also points out the influence of Gandhiji on the socialist movement and thought in India. To quote him, "Gandhi and Vinoba may not have solved the stubborn socio-economic problems that socialism yearns to resolve but they have brought to their solution a new insight, an inspired method, an organic relatedness between the means and end.' Again, "Asia's large population, limited resources and retarded development make utopianism not a mere adventure in faith but the only hopeful avenue of progress. Loving care of ravished land, devoted dovetailing of men's labour alone can compensate for the gaping scarcity of capital."

Asoka Mehta also refers to the impact of the Moderates in India on the development of socialist thought in India in his book entitled "Democratic Socialism". To quote him, "It was to offer a solution to the flood of industrial goods flowing into Germany that Frederick List developed the theory of protection to infant industries. The same theory was developed in India by the late Justice Ranade. The Protectionist theory suggested that the state has a positive role to play in economic life. The blind forces of the market cannot be permitted to operate because if they do, all wealth would accumulate in England and men would decay in the rest of the world. Ranade's voice remained a voice in the wilderness. My point is that laws of the market were not respected by capitalists in undeveloped countries. For the first time, intervention achieved respectability. the policy of intervention in economic matters, interference with the operations of the market was inaugurated by the capitalists themselves. The Socialists now argue that this policy be carried to its logical conclusion. What is sauce for the capitalist goose is sauce for the working class gander. State must intervene at every stage and instead of leaving economic decision to the blind forces of the market, these decisions should be taken by a Central Planning authority".

It is also pointed out that the Western intellectuals like Martin Buber, Rosa Luxemberg and many other social scientists have influenced the socialist thought in India by their latest researches.

The view of Asoka Mehta is that Indian socialism is democratic socialism and differs from Communism. Discriminating socialisation is the distinctive characteristic of democratic socialism because total or galloping nationalisation and political democracy cannot exist together. Total planning is inconsistent with democracy. To quote Asoka Mehta, "Socialist policies relevant to stages of economic growth have to be worked out by Asian socialists themselves, the choice of growth-producing sector in the economy, the varying techniques of production to be employed, the use of surplus man-power as a source of capital, the pattern of development in relation to the rate of growth desired".

The Socialists in India are indebted to Western socialist thought and leadership but socialist policies in India are bound to be different on account of the differences in the circumstances in various countries. India is an industrially undeveloped country and her social conditions are also dif-

ferent from other countries. Industrialisation and mechanisation are essential for economic development and for that economic planning is essential. Priority must be given to those productive activities which would improve and revolutionise the tools and techniques. That requires the development of iron and steel and coal and power industries. The surplus man-power of India which is also a source of capital, has to be utilised to the full. To quote Asoka Mehta, "Being an under-developed country, accumulation of capital in India will not be painless. We shall have to depend on our immense human resources to further the formation of capital. Roads will have to be built, canals cut and tanks repaired by human labour. That labour must come through the willing consent of the people."

In addition to industrialisation on a large scale, there is also the necessity of the development of small-scale and medium industries. In the words of Asoka Mehta, "During the long gestation periods consumer goods will have to be augmented by the most efficient use of available light industries and productivisation of traditional handicrafts".

Emphasis has also to be put on village economy and agricultural production. The Indian socialists do not subscribe to the Gandhian view of the village as a self-sufficient economic unit. According to them, the village has to provide not only the foodgrains for the village people but also something more to be put in the market. The village economy has to be linked with the economy of the whole country. "The village will be transformed from little cluster of houses—cut off from the world, tucked away into the recesses of the earth—to progressive communities, connected with the rest of the world with electric railways, telephones, radios, roads, buses. The village too will become an industrial unit of production like the city." The Indian socialists put emphasis on the role of peasants in the agrarian economy of the country. They admit that the peasant is a neglected subject in socialism. Asoka Mehta points out that the Asians who do not have virgin lands or colonies to exploit, have to face the problem of peasant in a different way. Limited resources, pressure of population and the urgent need for capital accumulation make the search for the locus of surplus value of crucial importance. Jayaprakash Narayan admitted the difficulty of introducing socialism in a pre-dominantly agricultural country. To quote him, "We might use fewer labour-saving agricultural machinery in view of our population and the shortage of land as compared with the virgin expanses of Russia's territory. This does not mean that we shall retain the present inefficient plough but perhaps we may not require, at least till industrial development absorbs the surplus rural population, many tractors and mechanical reapers and binders."

Jayaprakash Narayan recommended cooperative farming in these words: "Socialism in agriculture, i.e., cooperative and collective farming is essential for the success of any attempt to recast Indian life on a socialist basis. Socialism can never go with millions of peasants owning their own patches of land, cultivating them for their own profit—narrow selfish peasants. In the same community, a part, the smaller part in India and most other countries, cannot live and work in a corporate manner while the remaining and larger part remains wedded to individualism—with all its waste product of social friction and frustration". Again, "No individual holding remains

and the basis of distribution is only the amount of labour put in and in some unusual cases unusual needs. But even in the collective village, individual ownership of tools may yet remain and pigs and cattle and horse may yet be the property of individuals".

The Indian Socialists also want the state to help agricultural production by supplying fertilizers, better seeds, insecticides etc. The voluntary labour in the villages has also to be utilised. "In hundreds of thousands of villages, there is scope for tremendous conservation and development, if the assistance given by the state is intelligently linked up with local labour, voluntarily offered, a new dimension of growth is opened up."

The Indian Socialists advocate the abolition of untouchability and seclusion of women which they consider to be essential for the progress of the country. To quote Asoka Mehta, "Constructive work, re-structuring of the village community alone can generate cooperation and the spirit that would help the traditional elements to get productivised. Modernisation is necessary but the new spirit is needed to create a cultural milieu wherein it becomes possible to absorb large investments and higher techniques".

The Indian Socialists want to establish an egalitarian society in the country by abolishing the existing inequalities based on caste and class. In the industrial field, they want the gradual abolition of private property. In the agricultural field, this requires the abolition of the Zamindari system and a re-distribution of land with the object of breaking up the big holdings and making the smaller holdings economically productive. No one should be allowed to own any land who does not reside in the village and who actually does not cultivate the same. The village Panchayats should have the power to allocate land to all the actual tillers. The peasants will be persuaded to join cooperative farms. The Indian Socialists feel that too much violence was used in Russia while implementing the policy of collectivisation in agriculture. Jayaprakash Narayan writes, "In Russia, collectivisation was pushed through at great human cost and under a ruthless dictatorship. Estimates run up to as high a figure as twenty millions of those who had to be liquidated in order to make collectivisation a success. I do not favour such a collosal repression of the toiling peasant masses, nor does socialist theory permit it. Abolition of landlordism, redistribution of land and breaking up of big holdings would require state coercion to be used against fifteen to twenty percent of the agricultural population perhaps. But collectivisation might require sixty to seventy percent of that population to be repressed. Cooperative farming itself would require a good measure of coercion. Collectivisation on the other hand would require a degree of wholesale repression that is repugnant to socialism".

The Indian Socialism denounced revolutionary violence and certain features of the Russian and Chinese Revolutions which involve excessive use of violence. Their ideology comes closer to Fabian Socialism. They do not condemn capitalist democracy as such. Their view is that it can be transformed into a socialist democracy without recourse to violence.

It is to be observed that the Indian socialist movement has become weak. That is partly due to the fact that its programme has been adopted

by other political parties. The Indian National Congress accepted the ideal of a socialistic pattern of society at its Avadi session in January 1955. At the Bhubaneshwar session of the Congress in January 1964, the constitution of the Congress was amended to make democratic socialism by peaceful methods the objcetive of the Congress Party. In 1976, the Preamble of the Indian Constitution was amended and the word "Socialist" was added in the Preamble itself.

Socialist Ideology and Strategy before Independence

The ideology of the Indian socialists before Independence was an amalgam of radical nationalism, democratic socialism, superficial Marxism and Gandhism. The socialists began to assert themselves as a separate identity during the 1930s. They were not satisfied with the resolution of the Indian National Congress passed at its Karachi session in 1931 on fundamental rights and economic policy. They demanded nationalisation of all the essential means of production. They also advocated class war and the necessity of confiscation of all private property. This was condemned by the Indian National Congress which maintained that the concept of class struggle and confiscation of land and other private property was not acceptable to it.

Both Acharya Narendra Deva and Jayaprakash Narayan subscribed to the theory of scientific socialism and not to any humanitarian or Utopian variety of socialism. The socialists maintained that socialism was not merely a code of personal conduct and a theory of individuaul reform. It was an ideology for the reorganisation of the entire social and economic life of the people and a doctrine for a comprehensive social, economic, culturual and political transformation of the country including its farms, factories and schools. That was possible only through the seizure of state power. That was not possible so long as Britain ruled India and hence the socialist leaders maintained that they must first have national freedom before they could think of building socialism in the country. They did believe in class struggle but that was to remain in the background so long as India did not become independent.

As regards the strategy of the socialists before Independence, they were an integral part of the Indian National Congress. They had no desire to convert the Indian National Congress into a full-fledged Socialist Party fighting for the peasants and the workers. They only wanted to make the Congress more radical and revolutionary in its attitude towards the British Government. When the Civil Disobedience movement started again in 1932, Jayaprakash Narayan was the Acting General Secretary of the Congress. After the imprisonment of the other national leaders, he organised an underground resistance movement. The Indian socialists took an active part in the non-violent forms of struggle under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi but they did not rule out the possibility of a violent revolution or an armed uprising for the achievement of national independence. Their view was that once India became independent, socialism could be achieved by peaceful methods and there was to be no necessity of killing the individual landowners and capitalists. The Indian socialists also allowed the Communists to join the Congress Socialist Party upto 1940 when they were expelled from

the Party. The Indian socialists took an active part in the Quit India Movement of 1942.

Socialist Ideology and Strategy Since Independence

The Indian socialists were considerably influenced by the ideology of Mahatma Gandhi and the ideas of Western liberal democracy. They were not whole-hearted followers of any particular ideology. Gradually, they began to maintain that Marxism as a dogma should be revised to make it more useful.

The Indian socialists were called revisionists on the ground that they wanted the Marxist ideas to be revised in the light of new experiences. They declared that the class struggle between the capitalists and workers need not be resolved through a violent revolution. They opposed the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat. They opposed the Russian system of collective farming which involved a lot of violence. They also opposed the concentration of too much of economic power in the hands of the state. They opposed indiscriminate nationalisation of every industry. They stood for an egalitarian society in India by abolishing the existing inequalities based on caste and class. In the industrial sphere, they demanded the abolition of private property. In the agricultural sphere, they wanted the abolition of the Zamindari system and a redistribution of land with the object of breaking up the big holdings and making the small holdings economically productive. No person was to be allowed to own any land if he did not reside in the village or did not actually cultivate the land. The village Panchayats were to have the power to allocate land to all the actual tillers. The peasants were to be persuaded to join cooperative farms.

The socialist leaders in India also made a distinction between socialism and Communism. They denounced revolutionary violence and certain features of the Russian and Chinese revolutions which involved an excessive use of violence. The problem of increasing production was given as much importance as the problem of equitable distribution. They contended that the poor would not be satisfied with political democracy for long unless there was economic development in the country. Political democracy alone was not enough and had to be supplemented by economic democracy.

The Indian socialists came nearer to Gandhiji. Jayaprakash Narayan renounced materialism as a philosophy and embraced spiritualism as a way of life. Under the influence of Gandhism, Jayaprakash Narayan left the Socialist Party and joined the Bhoodan movement of Vinoba Bhave. In 1962, Asoka Mehta left the Party to join the Congress Government at the Centre. M. R. Masani joined the Swatantra Party. In 1974, Jayaprakash Narayan re-entered active politics to provide leadership to a popular campaign against the Congress misrule in Gujarat and Bihar.

Though the Socialists were critical of some aspects of the Indian Constitution, they welcomed the introduction of universal adult suffrage as the basis of the Indian political system. They declared that they would not resort to violent methods for the achievement of their socialist objectives. Acharya Narendra Deva did not believe in non-violence but his view was that there was no other practical alternative available to the Indian people and hence he praised the Satyagraha method of Gandhiji. In 1953, Jaya-

prakash Narayan tried to come to terms with Jawaharlal Nehru for cooperation in the political field. However, nothing came out of it because the move was opposed by Narendra Deva and Lohia. The socialists like Dr. Lohia and Madhu Limaye continued to criticise the socialistic pretensions of Nehru and the Congress as a big hoax. In 1964, Asoka Mehta became a Cabinet Minister in the Central Government. In 1967, Ram Manohar Lohia appealed to all opposition parties to forge a united front against the Congress. There was partial success and non-Congress ministries were formed in many states. After the coming into power of Indira Gandhi in 1980, the socialists in India ceased to exist as an independent political force.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Armugam, M. : *Socialist Thought in India : The Contribution of Rammanohar Lohia*, New Delhi, 1978.

Bhargava, G.S. : *Leaders of the Left*, Bombay, 1951.

Bhasin, Prem : *Socialism in India.*

Besant, Annie : *Future Socialism.*

Chowdhry, S.R. : *Leftist Movements in India.*

Gadre, Kamala : *Indian Way to Socialism*, New Delhi, 1966.

Ghosh, Ajoy : *Theories and Practices of the Socialist Party of India*, Bombay 1952.

Ghose, Sankar : *Socialism and Communism in India.*

Lakhanpal, P.L. : *History of the Congress Socialist Party.*

Limaye, Madhu : *Evolution of the Socialist Party*, Hyderabad, 1952.

Nanda, B.R. (Ed.) : *Socialism in India*, Delhi, 1972.

Narain, Brij (Prof.) : *Indian Socialism*, Lahore, 1937.

Rose, Paul : *Socialism in Southern Asia.*

Rusch, Thomas : *Role of Congress Socialist Party in the Indian National Congress*, Chicago, 1955-6.

Sampurnananda : *Memoirs and Reflections.*

Sampurnananda : *Indian Socialism.*

Sinha, L.P. : *The Left Wing in India.*

CHAPTER XXVI

Some Socialist Leaders and Thinkers : Narendra Deva, Lohia, J. P. and Asoka Mehta

ACHARYA NARENDRA DEVA (1889-1956)

Acharya Narendra Deva was a socialist leader. He was born at Sitapur on 13 October, 1889 and he died on 19 February, 1956. For many years, he was associated with Kashi Vidyapeeth, first as a lecturer and then as Principal. He was the Vice-Chancellor of Lucknow and Banaras Hindu Universities for a few years. As a youngman, he was very much influenced by the Extremist leaders like Tilak and Aurobindo. He was elected the President of the Congress Socialist Party in 1934 and became a national leader. He was a great thinker. He took keen interest in the peasant movement and was elected twice the President of All-India Kisan Sabha. He was also a member of the Working Committee of the all-India Congress Committee for many years. He was opposed to the Congress Socialist Party leaving the Indian National Congress in 1948. He welcomed the merger of the Congress Socialist Party with the Krishak Mazdoor Praja Party in September 1952. He stood for a revolutionary transformation of the existing social order. He was an orator in English, Hindi and Urdu. He had a sterling character and a massive intellect.

The political ideas of Acharya Narendra Deva are to be found in his book entitled "Socialism and the National Revolution" which was published in 1946, "Rashtriyata Aur Samajvad" published in 1949 and many other papers written by him and the speeches delivered by him from time to time. His writings show that he was influenced not only by Tilak, Aurobindo and Gandhiji but also by Karl Marx.

As a Marxist

Ideologically, Acharya Narendra Deva was a Marxist although he was very much near Gandhiji. He believed that there was nothing static in history which was always on the move. To quote him, "We can perform the task before us only if we try to comprehend the principles and purposes of socialism and to understand the dialectical method propounded by Marx for the correct understanding of the situation and make that understanding the basis of true action. We must take our stand on scientific socialism and steer clear of Utopian socialism or social reformism. Nothing short of a revolutionary transformation of the exisitng social order can meet the needs of the situation".

He also believed in the materialistic interpretation of history. His view was that capitalism had exhausted its creative possibilities and stood in the way of the expansion of production. The growth of monopolies also

stood in the way of production. Humanity could be saved only by scientific socialism. To quote him, "All that Marx means to say is that an idea can influence the course of history only when it realises itself in fact and thus becomes a thing. He has nowhere considered the question of relative importance of mind and matter. Both are equally important. Man cannot crete anything independently of the objective situation nor can objective situation by itself produce a result desired by man without his active participation. He only used the expression to distinguish his method from the idealism of Hegel who denied the reality of the world of experience and only recognised an absolute idea. Marx does hold that many causes operate in the evolution of history. Marx has always held that what was originally derivative had the power of becoming an independent cause. Therefore, it is wrong to say that Marx recognised only one single cause of historical evolution."

Ethical Socialist

Unlike Marx, Narendra Deva was an ethical socialist who had faith in moral values. At some places, he has described socialism as a cultural movement based on humanist foundations. He has criticised the Communists who are the inheritors of Marxism, in these words: "Communism is not pledged to democracy and has no respect for those values which are so essential for development of human personality. It ridicules parliamentary democracy for the survival of which it fought so hard during the last War. It has no use for a code of morals and will not hesitate to have resort to methods of doubtful morality if for the moment, it better serves its ends".

Classes

Acharya Narendra Deva accepted the criteria and classification of classes as given by Bukharin and agreed with him that in addition to the bourgeoisie and the labourers, there were other classes like the middle classes and mixed classes in a society. His view was that the workers must have, as a class, control over the management of industry. He believed in the theory of class struggle. He advocated an alliance between the lower middle classes and the masses. He believed that the masses would become class conscious only when an appeal was made to them in economic terms. His view was that the working class was the vangurad in the struggle against the foreign Government. He had no faith in reforms and constitutional methods and stood for mass action. He called upon the socialists to join the nationalist movement for the liberation of India. He supported the Quit India Resolution of 1942 passed by the Indian National Congress and wanted a united front of the industrial workers, the peasants and the petty bourgeoisie. Only then, there could be political and economic emancipation of the country.

Kisan Sabhas

Acharya Narendra Deva was in favour of organising Kisan Sabhas to improve the condition of the peasants who were to be mobilised for action. They were to be educated. Their poverty was to be removed. They were to be inspired with socialist ideology. Cooperative societies were to be set up everywhere. Even agriculture was to be put on a cooperative basis. He

demanded the cancellation of all debts and the grant of cheap credit to the peasants. He wanted every problem to be tackled after taking into consideration the interests of the nation as a whole and hence was opposed to "peasantism". He stood for a democratic set up in the villages.

Idea of Strike

He was an advocate of the idea of general strike and was influenced in this respect by George Sorel. His view was that a general strike will have two consequences. It will bring about a total paralysis of the economy of the country and force the foreign exploiters out of the country. The strength gained from a general strike could be used to bring about a social reformation. To quote him, "In India, unlike Russia, the proletarian weapon of strike has not yet been the signal for mass action, but the working class can extend its political influence only when by using its weapon of general strike in the service of the national struggle, it can impress the petty bourgeoisie with the revolutionary possibilities of a strike."

Prospects of Revolution in India

Acharya Narendra Deva did not accept the view that as India was industrially backward and a land of agriculturists, there could be no revolution in this country. He maintained that a social revolution was apt to break out in India where the masses had been brought on the brink of starvation and were completely ruined by economic exploitation at the hands of the bourgeoisie and the imperialists. To quote him, "A Socialist revolution has every chance of breaking out first in a country where the masses have been ruined by economic exploitation even though the country is not sufficiently developed industrially, if the revolutionary situation is present. India does satisfy all these conditions. As the crisis develops, the conditions become worse." The Acharya accepted the view of Lenin that the socialist revolution would break out not necessarily in a country which was industrially most advanced, but also where the chain of imperialism was the weakest. The Acharya advocated a revolutionary transformation of the existing social order.

Class Struggle

The Acharya believed in the theory of class struggle and did not accept Gandhiji's theory of class conversion. He did not accept the theory of two classes, the haves and have-nots. To quote him, "The process of intensive differentiation amongst the various classes of society has been going on in the country with greater and greater rapidity, cutting more and more layers of the upper and the middle classes from the national movement. New classes are being formed and are being separated from the great mass of people". However, he gave more importance to the working classes than the others.

Agrarian Reconstruction

Narendra Deva was an advocate of agrarian reconstruction. He considered that to be very essential for improving the lot of the peasantry in India. To quote him, "Unless the material and moral condition of his

life is immediately improved, social reform movement, however beneficent it may be, will not go a long way to make him a valuable, self-respecting member of society". He put great emphasis on the growth of cooperatives in the villages. He advocated the starting of a New Life Movement in the villages and the spread of socialistic ideology among the people. To quote him, "The village can be set on its feet only as a cooperative commonwealth which must have a democratic base in the shape of free peasants. The village must be rid of corrupt, exacting and oppressive police force. The Village Panchayat should have some control over this machinery. Constructive work and social service will have their full play. Above all, they will organise peasants to fight anti-social elements and process of oppression and exploitation".

Secularism

Narendra Deva was not a revivalist but a scholar nationalist. He believed in secularism although he was not indifferent to religion. To quote him, "When Congress talks of secular democracy, it does mean it. We must extend our hand of cooperation to the Congress in wiping out of existence communal hatred and passions and help it to eradicate the poison of communalism. It is essential that an atmosphere of secular democracy must pervade the country if our state has to gather strength."

Faith in Revolution

Narendra Deva was opposed to the constructive programme of Gandhiji. The reason was that such a programme could not create the cult of revolution or make the people class-conscious. To quote him, "Whatever else constructive programme might have achieved, it was certainly not a suitable instrument for a revolutionary social change." He did not appreciate the policy of alternating between direct action in revolutionary situation and constructive work in a period of inaction. His view was that the situation always remained revolutionary under a proper leadership. To quote him, "Equipped with a socialist ideology and immersed in the work of making the masses economically conscious and politically organised, we can, with confidence, look forward to the future and hope in the fullness of time to lead the organised masses of India to freedom and full manhood. The next revolutionary wave will be much bigger and mightier".

Visionary

Acharya Narendra Deva was a visionary and he was confident of a bright future for the workers and peasants. To quote him, "When the masses were once awakened and become enlightened, they will come into their own and will establish their supremacy".

Democratic Socialism

Acharya Narendra Deva has given his views on democratic socialism in India. According to him, "The Indian socialist movement is the vanguard of the peasants and the workers. The agricultural economy is not to be subordinated to industrial economy. The casteless society is to be established because caste system "checks social mobility, perpetuates voca-

tional rigidity, militates against free association, upholds anti-democratic traditions, degrades the dignity of labour and denies to the toiling masses even social dignity".

Democratic socialism is opposed to totalitarianism and bureaucratism, It stands for decentralisation of power and responsibility. Village Panchayat is to be the chief organ of state authority. There is to be democracy in the villages. Functional associations have to be organised on democratic lines. There is to be decentralisation both in administrative and economic spheres.

Democratic socialism demands the socialisation of industries. Large-scale industries are to be owned by the community and managed by the Government of India, the State Governments and the local bodies. Proper attention must also be given to small-scale industries. Provision must be made for the participation of workers in the national industries. They will have representation on the Boards of Management but the right to direct control and supervise the management will remain with the public authorities. To quote Narendra Deva, "Socialisation must take a form that is adjusted to the nature of the industry so that it may always result in higher output, better distribution and greater security and freedom for the workers".

Cooperatives have to be given an important place in democratic socialism. Cooperation is to be the basic principle of the new village economy. Cooperative farming and multi-purpose cooperative societies should be organised for marketing, irrigation and the supply of better seeds, manures and implements.

Under democratic socialism, there is to be democracy in industry also. There is to be cooperation between manual workers and the managers and technicians in socialist economy. "Unity of knowledge and labour is an important principle of socialism. The process of the social assimilation of intellectual and manual workers deserves to be welcomed and consciously promoted as it leads to social harmony".

Under democratic socialism, emphasis is put on social morality. To quote Narendra Deva, "Democratic socialism believes in moral evolution of men through the ages and regards socialist morality as its fulfilment. It resolves contradictions and conflicts in moral ideas, vitalises moral principles of essentially humanistic character and preserves such traditional forms as are not inconsistent with socialism".

Under democratic socialism, efforts have to be made to promote the cultural process through the fusion of cultures and adaptation to new conditions without impairing cultural autonomy of any region.

Democratic socialism is opposed to imperialism and colonialism. It denounces racial segregation and upholds the principles and objectives of the United Nations. It is against the expansion of the Soviet Union and the political hegemony of the United States. To quote Acharya Narendra Deva, "The salvation of the world lies in democratic socialism and only those who have a firm faith in democracy and socialism can be the vanguard of the new movement for world peace".

It is contended that Acharya Narendra Deva was not original in his

ideas. However, it cannot be denied that whatever he said, he said clearly and with force. He wrote with the set object of strengthening the socialist movement and the Kisan Sabhas. He put emphasis on the humanist foundations of socialism and the necessity of an economic ideology for mobilising the masses.

Dr. RAM MANOHAR LOHIA (1910-1967)

In the words of Madhu Limaye, Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia was an original thinker, a unique leader and a rebel. He played an important part in the making of Modern India. He was not an ivory-tower philosopher. He was essentially a man of action. He played an important role during the freedom movement of the country. He made a significant contribution to the progress of the socialist movement in India. He was a fiery propagandist of socialist thought. He was a brilliant conversationalist. He was colourful and had a sense of drama. He could match words to the occasion. He was not a narrow-minded politician. He was a man of wide interests. He was equally at home in history and philosophy as well as in literature, sculpture, painting and architecture. He was free from attachment of money and family. As a matter of fact, he considered the entire human race as his family. He was a great patriot but he also believed in the unity of human race. He subscribed to the concept of the citizenship of the mind, citizenship of ideals without the restrictiveness of nationality or race. He dreamt of an international order where he could travel around the world without passports and without visas. He treated a prince and a pauper alike. He had a spiritual bond with the poor, the neglected and the exploited. He was a source of inspiration for the youth of the country. He always encouraged them to forge ahead and show their mettle.

His Life

Ram Manohar Lohia was born on 23 March, 1910 in an ordinary middle class family in Akbarpur in Uttar Pradesh. His father, Hira Lal, was himself a freedom fighter. He completed his schooling in Bombay and received his higher education in Calcutta and the Banaras Hindu University. He had an admirable command over English, German and French. His Hindi was very powerful. He had a good knowledge of Bengali, Gujarati, Marathi and other Indian languages. He got his Doctorate from the Berlin University in 1933 at the age of 23. The Congress Socialist Party was formed in 1934 and from the very beginning, Dr. Lohia was a pillar of the Congress Socialist Party. When Jawaharlal Nehru reorganised the office of the All-India Congress Committee at Allahabad, he put Dr. Lohia incharge of the Foreign Department. As Foreign Secretary of the Congress, Dr. Lohia established close relations with the freedom movements and progressive organisations in Asia, Africa and Latin America, He came into close touch with Mahatma Gandhi soon after his return to India and was deeply influenced by Gandhiji's ideals, values and methods. He considered Gandhiji's ideas of civil resistance and non-cooperation as an original creation of the twentieth century. When Dr. Lohia was arrested in 1940 for his anti-war speeches, Mahatma Gandhi reacted very strongly. Mahatma Gandhi, Dr. Lohia and the other Socialists opposed the Cripps Plan in March-April 1942. Mahatma Gandhi sent his draft resolution on Quit India movement to the

All-India Congress Committee meeting held at Allahabad towards the end of April 1942. In the meeting of the Congress Committee, Dr. Lohia opposed Jawaharlal Nehru and called upon the Congress Committee to adopt Gandhiji's draft. After the metting, Dr. Lohia warned Jawaharlal Nehru that if he did not agree with Gandhiji, the people of India especially the youth, would not listen to him.

When the Congress leaders were arrested on 9 August, 1942 Dr. Lohia went underground. He set up in Bombay a Central Directorate of the Indian National Congress to organise and direct the Quit India movement. When Jayaprakash Narayan escaped from Hazaribagh jail, Dr. Lohia joined him and the other resisters. Both Jayaprakash Narayan and Dr. Lohia guided the movement from their hideouts in Nepal. Dr. Lohia was the chief architect of the August struggle. His role was both towering and decisive.

After his release from jail in 1946, Dr. Lohia happened to visit Goa. When he saw that elementary civil liberties were being denied to the people of Goa by the Portuguese Government, he immediately lanuched his crusade for civil liberties at Margoa in Goa. He was arrested in June 1946.

India won independence on 15 August 1947. Communal riots broke out in Northern India. Dr. Lohia offered his services to Mahatma Gandhi in his efforts to restore peace. On many occasions, he risked his own life while doing the work of pacification. As long as Mahatma Gandhi was alive, Dr. Lohia hoped for a socialistic transformation of the Indian National Congresses, but after his death, he left the Congress in order to build up a progressive and dynamic alternative to it. His view was that the Congress had become a status quo party. He spent the rest of his life working for the Socialist Party. In 1964, he was arrested in the United States for his participation in the Negro equal rights movement. He died in New Delhi on 12 October, 1967.

Constructive Work

Dr. Lohia put great emphasis on constructive work. He believed that no fundamental transformation was possible unless state power was controlled, guided and tamed by people's power. He gave the formula for combining jail, spade and vote for achieving a social revolution in the country. He tried to persuade the youth of the country to devote "one hour's free and voluntary labour" for national reconstruction. Dr. Lohia not only advocated the need for a fundamental reordering of the social relations in India but also provided an ideological basis for that change. He called that radical transformation as Saptakranti or Seven Revolutions. There is not much difference between the seven revolutions of Dr. Lohia and the Concept of Sarvodaya of Mahatma Gandhi. Dr. Lohia stood for an anti-imperalist and anti-colonial revolution. He wanted the establishment of a World Parliament and a World Government to which the sovereign national states were to transfer a part of their sovereignty voluntarily. He disliked the exploitative aspect of world capitalism. While he praised the work done by the Communists for the common people, he detested the centralisation, violence and suppression of the mind implicit in the Communist system. He put Henry Ford and Joseph Stalin in the same category.

Social Equality

He was a champion of social equality. He condemned the caste system and considered it as the single most important factor responsible for the decline of India and its repeated subjection to external aggression and foreign rule. He started a "destroy caste" movement. He was in favour of giving special concessions and opportunities to the backward classes, Harijans, Adivasis, women etc. for a long time with a view to bring them up to the level of the advanced sections of society.

He was opposed to the continuation of the use of English language in the country. He was an advocate of Hindi. It was under his inspiration that Tamil Nadu and other Southern languages were introduced in Lok Sabha and non-Hindi speaking people started using Hindi and other Indian languages in Parliament and outside.

Opposition to Statism

He was opposed to statism. He valued privacy and freedom and detested the right of the state to control every aspect of national life. He condemned the misuse of Sections 107-109 of the Code of Criminal Procedure against the poor and the helpless. He called those Sections the MISA of the poor people. He continued to fight for civil liberties in the courts as well as outside.

Lohia on Growth of Capitalism

According to Dr. Lohia, the history of capitalist development was also the history of increasing poverty of the colonial people and their reduction to landless labour. He pointed out that during the two centuries since the second half of the eighteenth century, four distinct rings had evolved in the outer colonial circle: the outermost composed of landless labour in agriculture, the second band of peasantry, factory worker and lower middle-class such as small trader and primary school teacher, then the rather thin ring of the middle classes and the almost invisible streak of monopoly capitalists. Colonial poverty was an integral aspect of the capitalist world. The economic retardation in India was due to the development of capitalism in Western Europe. British textiles did not overcome Indian textiles in an economic way but through geo-political means, i.e., the English East India Company.

According to Dr. Lohia, capitalism from its origin to its most recent development has moved mainly on the imperial dynamics. The distinction between imperial labour and colonial labour and their respective wages is of great importance for a proper understanding of the source of surplus value in relation to the produce of labour within a single isolated or national value. Dr. Lohia was emphatic that we have to give up discussing surplus economic structure. We have to discuss surplus value in relation to the world's total production and the fact of different national wage trends. According to Dr. Lohia, "Labour, whether of the peasant or the factory worker, creates surplus value to the extent that its earnings fall below the average per worker world production of its time." The supply and demand theory ignores the forced conditions within which the exchange takes place. It is of little use to changing economies based on changing forms of owner-

ship and rule. Marxian theory is also inadequate in view of the imperial-colonial inequality in the application of science. In Lohia's critique of capitalist development, there are five relevant entities. The two entities of labour and productive equipment are of fundamental character. They act and react upon each other in the context of other entities such as world relationships, political rule and economic ownership.

His View of History

As aganst the view of Karl Marx that history is the history of class struggle, Dr. Lohia suggested the hypothesis of internal oscillation between caste and class. Dr. Lohia regards them as social forces arising from motivational patterns. Class implies the free play of interests struggling for an increasing share in the national output. A caste implies the acceptance of a fixed social design. Class motivates soicety towards change for equality. Caste is the motive for stability. They are expressed within the context of a society that rises and declines.

Western Technology

According to Dr. Lohia, Western technology has meant economic progress and equality in the West but it has resulted in the retardation of Indian economy. The social movement of the West which was internally egalitarian was externally exploitative. Such a development reached its maximum efficiency with the geographical limits of the world. As against the maximum efficiency of capitalist civilisation, Dr. Lohia stand for total efficiency of mankind in addition to internal equality within the national frontiers. Over half of the population living in two-thirds of the world is unemployed. The only way to overcome industrial and scientific inequalities is through ushering in of a new civilisation and a new technology. It is necessary to invent new tools and to manufacture them.

Small Unit Machine

According to Ds. Lohia, "The large-scale machine, high rationalisation etc. may give a few Kanpurs and Calcuttas but it will create around these islands of frenzied activity colossal unemployment and poverty." To turn a peasant of India, Java or China into a worker, a cultivator into a tractor driver or to provide a factory worker with the concentrated capital of modern technology may or may not be a high endeavour but its achievement is impossible. Lands averaged around 15 acres for every agricultural worker in Russia before collectivization and the tractor brought them on somewhat at a level with American agriculture, but where average land is between one acre and one and a half as in India and China, the Communist modernisation would throw crores of people out of work. In India, not less than seven crores of persons were unemployed.

Dr. Lohia emphasized the need for a small machine technology. The new technology should be such as not to demand the high capitalisation of Western standards and would give rational employment to ten times the number possible by Western standards of rationalisation for a given annual investment.

The new technology will require a small unit. It will not require con-

centration and will go into the village and the town. To quote Dr. Lohia, "The small unit machine need not necessarily be less efficient than the heavily capitalised machine, for apart from social gains, there is no way yet to compare the accountancy of roundabout production with that of immediate production. Furthermore, the advocates of the small unit machine do not totally reject mass production where is is inescapable."

Dr. Lohia called upon the scientists and technicians to direct their energies into the invention of small unit machinery. Villages and towns of India have abundant raw material of various kinds which is beng wasted at present. Its processing and manufacture is possible only when small machinery is available. Dr. Lohia was thinking of a time "when over all country, in towns and villages, will be spread millions of little power-driven machines for producing wealth and easing the pressure on land."

Food Army

Dr. Lohia was in favour of the organisation of peasant movement in developing latent powers of the country and the peasants. He observed thus in 1950, "Our task is to break the shackles of society, to bring flow to the waters that have grown stagnant. This is possible when there is a real flowering of the social forces that are now dormant."

At the core of every problem in the country is the stupendous poverty of the people and it is directly traceable to the dearth of productive occupations, the denial of social justice and an increasing population. In a paper entiled "The Farmer in India", Dr. Lohia formulated the following plan to end the poverty in the country.—

(1) Lowering of the prices on the basis of parity between agricultural and industrial prices.

(2) Austerity and sacrifice to be shared by all so that no income or salary exceeds Rs. 1000/- a month.

(3) Industrialisation with the help of small unit machines to be invented and manufactured by the state.

(4) Any factory running below its capacity to be taken over by the state and immediate nationalisation of basic industries.

(5) Housing programmes and other economic activity to provide full employment.

(6) Cultivation of one crore acres of new land by a state-recruited food army.

(7) Land to the tiller and re-division of lands. The minimum land was to be 12½ acres and the maximum 30 acres. The wrong entries in the registers of the Patwaris to be corrected.

(8) Decentralisation of administration and economy to achieve the four-pillar state. The repeal of discriminatory laws.

(9) Immediate adult franchise elections in unrepresented areas viz., merged states and Unions.

(10) The pursuit of a positive policy of world peace through promoting full freedom and right for all nations.

(11) Voluntary bands for agriculture, irrigation, road-making and the like.

(12) Anti-Corruption Commissioners in every state and at the Centre with Departments independent of the Government.

Citing the example of the land army in Britain which brought in the year 1942 nearly four million acres of new land under the plough, Dr. Lohia advocated the recruitment of a Food Army by the state. The Food Army in India should be able to bring at least ten million acres of land under cultivation per year for a period of two years. It will cost Rs. 150 crores in the first year and a similar amount in the next year. Provision is also to be made for Rs. 50 crores to meet any emergent expenditure or miscellaneous expenditure. The test for the Food Army "shall not be that of efficiency but that of attainability." Whatever is attainable by way of agricultural tools should be brought to the aid of the food army. At the end of two years, the Food Army will become self-sufficient. The major portion of the Food Army will be turned into farmers of modern villages which will be changed into cooperatives of various kinds and degrees in consultation with the people concerned. A trained technical personnel of more than 19,000 persons will become available to the country.

Dr. Lohia refers to five advantages of the Food Army:

(1) Additional employment to one million persons who, in course of time, may well become the nucleus for the livelihood of four or five million persons.

(2) Increase of food production by four million tonnes annually.

(3) Breaking down of barriers of class and caste and approach to economic equality.

(4) Founding of new villages whose joyous life may impel and support neighbouring villages towards activity.

(5) Encouragement to the industries of clothing and housing materials, particularly artisan manufacture.

According to Dr. Lohia, the Food Army will not only solve the immediate problems of food and employment but also the introduction of dynamic elements into the social structure and agricultural economy of our people.

Land Question

The view of Dr. Lohia was that the re-distribution of land will be not only an act of social justice but also a measure to increase production through development. He conceived voluntary labour as a third item of capital formation. He pointed out that a major part of the work of reconstruction in Yugoslavia was achieved through voluntary effort. His calculation was that if the four crores of adults in India volunteered an hour's labour every day, the task accomplished would equal those which the Government of India gets done by spending huge amounts every year. The reconstruction of the country is possible through the ordinarily known ways. The utilisation of the idle hours of the people is the greatest objective of a successful Government. This cannot be done on the basis of money payment. Increase in money supply has great dangers in a poor country like India. Funds through taxation can never be sufficient for this task which

can be done only on a voluntary basis. If people feel that they are the owners of fields and factories, they may have a feeling that their personal gains are possible only through social activity. Twenty crores of acres of land are not cultivated. "Voluntary labour of almost the entire adult population now engaged in agriculture could alone undertake such a gigantic task." If the bulk of them could be moved to give an hour's free labour to dig for canals, bunds and other reservoirs, the work of irrigation and cultivation could be done.

According to Dr. Lohia, the structure of land ownership in Indian villages results in disunities of behaviour, corruption of mind and a general absence of collective will. The only solution for the land problem in India is to think boldly and act courageously. "Those who actually till the land must be made secure masters of their harvest. This simple principle has to be legislated. Further legislation may come in its own time."

Dr. Lohia advocated the redivision of land among the tillers of land and this could be done throughout the country in five years under a socialist Government. "Land available for cultivation is around 40 crore acres, while the number of families depending on agriculture may at present be estimated between 4 and 5 crores."

Dr. Lohia was in favour of fixing a ceiling on the holding of land by individuals but he was opposed to the payment of fabulous amounts to big landlords and the creation of different categories of holdings on the basis of the ability of the peasant to pay. He criticised the Zamindari Abolition Fund as a blunder committed by the Congress which aligned itself with the landlords and capitalists. Only the smaller land-holders should be given a rehabilitation compensation. "All cultivable and uncultivable land must be brought under the control of the Central Government. Regional prejudices and separatism must not be allowed to play ducks and drakes with the food of the people, the unity of the country and glorious prospects of a revitalized and democratic social structure."

Food Problem

Dr. Lohia was opposed to the policy of food control. He put emphasis on an expanding economy, increasing production and better distribution. He recommended cooperative sales and purchase mechanism in place of the food administration. In order to keep the private trader out, he suggested the institution of grain banks which would be owned by the Panchayats, run by trained officers under the general control of the Panchayat and the Central Government would have first right over sales.

Dr. Lohia was opposed to any system of permits and licences which degenerate into a scramble for money, restriction of the movement of foodgrains from one state to another and the import of foodgrains from outside the country. Dr. Lohia recommended the establishment of grain cooperatives for solving the problem of food.

The view of Dr. Lohia was that the two virgin states of Vindhya and Rajasthan could be developed for the benefit of the country as a whole. If that was not done, there could be trouble for the country.

Four-Pillar State

According to Dr. Lohia, the small unit industries have to be taken together with the other aims such as food army and redivision of land. Those items must also fit in the frame-work which he called the four-pillar state. According to him, the Centre must have power enough to maintain the integrity and unity of the state and the rest of it must be fragmented. Dr. Lohia does not stand for a self-sufficient village but an intelligent and vital village. The four-pillar state is both a legislative and executive arrangement. The state is to be so organised and sovereign power so diffused that the active participation of the village community is achieved in the affairs of the country. Such an advance is possible when the country frames its Constitution on the basis of "the village, the district, the province and the Centre being the four pillars of state." According to Dr. Lohia, several departments such as those for cooperative societies, rural and agricultural development, a substantial part of irrigation, seeds, revenue collecting and the like may be transferred to the village and the district. A substantial part of state revenues, between one-third and fourth of the total revenue, should belong by right to the village and the district. The four-pillar state rises above the issues of regionalism and functionalism. If the development process is to become a mass movement, the power of decision-making on many important matters must belong directly to the people exercised through their immediate representative bodies. To give power to the village representative seems the only way to deliver the people from inertia as well as administration that is both top-heavy and corrupt. The only way to purify controls is to leave their administration to the village, town and district Panchayats and take them out of the hands of legislators and Government servants. It will clean up the administration in the end by the process of forcing the vast mass to judge and act. According to Dr. Lohia, a master campaign of literacy can be undertaken successfully in a four-pillar state which has been rid of landed and capitalist relationship.

Education

The view of Dr. Lohia was that the system of education in the country needed drastic changes. It neither trained the mind of the person nor made him fit to earn his livelihood. The prevalence of a foreign language was a great drawback. He wanted the educational system to be given new foundations. There should be a net-work of polytechnics and people's universities for the benefit of peasants, workers and the poor middle classes. He pointed out that countries like Germany and Sweden had been developed by workers and peasants who had gone to polytechnics off and on. Dr. Lohia demanded that expensive schools of snobbery must be closed.

Equality

According to Dr. Lohia, there are many aspects of equality. Legal equality is equality before the law. In a law court, the judge is not expected to recognise differences in social status between one individual and another and applies a single law irrespective of their social situation. The law of theft opertaes on all persons alike. However, the rich can take advantage of the benefit of doubt by employing a brilliant lawyer. (2) Once legal equality is established, the phase of political equality comes. Politi-

cal equality means the equality of the adult vote. Until recently only those persons were given the right to vote who had property and education. For a long time, women were not given the right to vote. (3) Economic equality in the sense of an increasing standard of living to everybody within the national frontiers has become a common element of all ideologies. Every European aspires for a better standard of living. (4) The general concept of equality is an atmosphere, a wish, a dream which is translated into concrete equality of one type or another with definite meaning like equality before the law, equality of food subsidy, a servant possessing a house, children's allowances, unemployment allowance, old age pension etc. These are all concrete ideas of equality.

Soviet Russia has achieved equality in the matter of providing mass medicine and primary education to the people as a whole. In specialised instruction and medicine, Germany and the United States are ahead of all. All West Europe and America are at the top in the matter of minimum food and clothes. Certain inequalities are stubborn. The most comfortable palace of today may become the slum of tomorrow. One may make housing sites equal but one locality may be more important or healthy than others. There are inequalities of birth and wealth. Some inequalities are caused by eloquence and talent.

Marterial equality among nations appears more difficult to achieve than material equality within the nation. It is true that one is dependent on the other. No nation can long remain equal within its frontiers if it is unequal against those outside. As water finds its level, so human society tends to approximate to its lowest levels unless those levels are otherwise raised. A political and economic structure has to be consciously designed which will close the gap within the nation and among nations. It is extremely doubtful if the existing industrial technology can achieve such an aim. Men who have tasted the joy of equality and unity within the universe can never be content until fullest possible material equality is realised. Complete equality may never be attained but the ideal must always be there.

Equality as against those placed above one's own station in life is easy to practise. Equality as against those placed below one's own station in life is comparatively hard to practise. The passion for equality would not restrict itself to the practice of sympathy. It would also practise anger, though not jealousy. There are people who try to lift themselves up with the lever of bitterness and jealousy rather than the development of their talents. The castes which have been oppressed for centuries tend to throw up a leadership which specialises in the demagogy of jealousy in order to attain equality with the classes of power and wealth. Even within these oppressed castes, men of real ability are left behind and get no chance to develop themselves. Crusaders of equality must develop virtues of efficiency and manners.

Compulsion, persuasion and example are the three time-honoured modes of bringing about equality but these modes have also their limits. If those limits are ignored, ignorance or fanaticism may yield unfortunate results. While the mode of personal example appears to be universal in application, persuasion has a comparatively smaller scope. Compulsion must mean that of the law or civil disobedience. A Government practises compulsion through

law and an opposition practises compulsion through civil disobedience. No other form of compulsion should be entertained as equality can never be achieved through the shedding of blood.

Equality is inward and outward as well as spiritual and material. It must therefore be grasped in all its four meanings. Material equality means the outward approximation among nations as well as the inward approximation within the nation. Spiritual equality means outward kinship as well as inward equanimity. Only an integrated concept of these four meanings of equanimity, kinship, material equality within the nation and among nations is worthy to become the object of life.

Decentralised Economy

According to Dr. Lohia, decentralised economy with small-scale organisation dispersed in villages and towns and organised on owner-worker or cooperative basis contitutes the sure technique for socialist transformation. He criticised both Communism and capitalism on the ground that the former borrowed from the latter the whole apparatus and technique of large-scale and centralised system of production. That elevates to a dizzy height a dictatorial party and a dictatorial state which does not bother about socialist values like equality, freedom, fraternity and fellowship.

The view of Dr. Lohia is that the philosophy of socialism is rooted on the *principle of immediacy*. A good economic system and political organisation must fulfil the test of immediacy. However, both Communism and capitalism are based on the principle of remoteness. The heavy-machine system of production alienates man from the system under which he works. If socialist values like equality, freedom, fraternity and fellowship are sacrificed under Communism, it is due to the alienation of man from the system which is based on the principle of remoteness—remoteness in ownership, operation and control. The machine system of large-scale production is combined with an authoritarian Party and a totalitarian state. To quote Dr. Lohia, "Ownership of property by the state exclusively at the Centre goes with mass production and is disastrous both for bread and freedom." Dr. Lohia was a critic of large-scale production by heavy machine, centralised ownership and control and the predominance of the state in the field of social reconstruction. Dr. Lohia advocated "a new mode of rationalisation and a corresponding mode of ownership" that shall through the operation of "the principle of immediacy" better promote socialist values.

Dr. Lohia, did not condemn technology. He wanted to harness modern technology to the need of a society that shall ensure full blossoming of the personality of man and his balanced and integrated development. The small unit machine will promote the principle of immediacy—immediacy in ownership, operation, control and output—and put an end to alienation which is associated with large-scale production with the help of heavy machines and centralised operation and control.

Decentralisation and diffusion of ownership and organisation are built into the system of small unit machine which "is the embodiment of the whole principle of decentralisation." The small unit machine will be available as much to hamlet and town as to city.

Dr. Lohia did not deny that basic industries like iron and steel and river-valley projects should be centrally owned, organised and operated, but he advocated dispersion of ownership and operation of less important sector of economy in homes and hamlets as much as centrally-owned by the state. He wanted the industries and economic enterprises to be so owned and organised that they provide maximum possible initiative to the people. He suggested that "property of appropriate types must be owned by the village and the province, as much as by the Centre and by cooperatives." He had a preference for cooperatives for communal form of ownership. To quote him, "Cooperatives of various kinds and degrees will be set up in order to organise the use of tools and cattle and also for marketing and other purposes. Cooperative agriculture shall also be encouraged in consultation with those willing to participate in such endeavour."

Dr. Lohia wanted the state to play an important role in the sphere of large-scale and basic industry. However, he desired to restrain and regulate the totalitarianism of the state, the party and the political bureaucracy by the induction of workers' control into the system and by the creation of independent autonomous corporations. To quote him, "After nationalisation of the industries, steps will be taken to set up independent autonomous corporations, representing labour, consumers and the Government to administer these industries."

Dr. Lohia was convinced that a decentralised system of economy with dispersion of ownership and diffusion of economic enterprises throughout the length and breadth of the country, operated in the homes of the workers and in hamlets, and cooperatively organised so far as possible, shall herald the advent of a true socialist civilisation.

Role of Party

Unlike M N. Roy and Jayaprakash Narayan who denied the role of party system, the view of Dr. Lohia was that party is an essential element of politics having a definite place in democracy. He advocated a two-way relationship between the people and the party so as to look upon an electoral reverse as a spur to further efforts in organised action. He believed that there was no alternative to vote. He considered democracy something absolutely necessary. According to him, constitutionalism alone was not a sufficient condition for democracy. The periodical elections must be supplemented by peaceful struggles to resist injustice. According to Dr. Lohia, both "vote and prison" constitute the two symbols of democracy denoting the roles of elections and civil disobedience movements.

Socialism in India

According to Dr. Lohia, socialism in India must be drastic instead of being gradual and unconstitutional whenever necessary. He put great emphasis on production. The course of action, formulated by Dr. Lohia, comprised the principles of constructive action, resistance against injustice and democracy, symbolised by *"spade, prison and vote"*.

Satyagraha

According to Dr. Lohia, issues like famine, land ownership, high prices,

dismissal and unemployment and police repression are daily acquiring such proportions that the whole of India may well become a vast stage for intermittent practices in Satyagraha. A day may come "when the whole nation is summoned to organise resistance against injustice and for the achievement of a new order." Dr. Lohia did not believe that there is no place for Satyagraha in a free country. He believed that the people must fight against injustice. Satyagraha will bring strength to the people and they will get over the habit of tolerating everything.

Planning in India

According to Dr. Lohia, planning in India adopted the course of raising the standard of life of small select portions of the population to the minimum European standards of living.

Dr. Lohia criticised the Government plans for their unique relation to external dependence. All that remains is the desire to get money from other countries and to balance income and expenditure. Dr. Lohia emphasized the fact that the foreign debts of India had increased and were increasing and those debts were a burden on the future generations of India. To quote him, "The adverse balance during the first plan was Rs. 300 crores, but it has now reached the figures of Rs. 6300 crores. I would like to say to man like Mr. Masani that Americans do not like planning in their own country, but like it elsewhere.... Without a plan, it becomes difficult for them to give loans or aid. For Indian Government also, it becomes difficult to justify things without a plan."

According to Dr. Lohia, the developed nations of the world might be of help to the under-developed nations if they direct their aid and research in science and engineering towards developing new small unit machines.

In the post-War world economy, the theory of development finance prevailed with its two prongs of foreign aid and deficit finance. External assistance was regarded as a critical factor in the developmental process to be supplemented by monetary expansion. In India, the IMF mission of 1953 emphasized the need for increased money supply and also urged the utilisation of the available sterling balances. The result was that trade deficit increased from Rs. 110 crores in 1955-56 to Rs. 440 crores in 1956-57 and to Rs. 640 crores in 1957-58.

New Trend in the World

Dr. Lohia pointed out the main distinction between the twentieth century and the nineteenth century. The earlier centuries allowed the stronger countries to grab and the weaker ones to fall. In the twentieth century, a strong country is interested "in just one proposition that no country should fall. If a country stands to fall, slap it, beat it up." Dr. Lohia did not find any distinction between the Soviet Union and the United States in this regard. To quote him, "Both of them act in a manner that would keep the people of India in morass of poverty. Forty-nine crores of people would continue to be poor, but there would be some 50 lakhs or one crore people spending over Rs. 1000 per month."

Dr. Lohia did not consider capitalism and Communism relevant to

solve the problems of Asia with its large populations and low capital equipment. He tried to give a new approach by the assimilation of the Gandhian principle of immediacy into the triple tasks of industrialisation, people's revolution and decentralisation of power.

Lohia as a Socialist

The views of Dr. Lohia on socialism are to be found in his book entitled "Marx, Gandhi and Socialism". Lohia stood for a compromise between the views of Marx and Gandhiji. His view was that it was not desirable to embrace either Marxism or Gandhism in its entirety and it was better to think of a via media or a synthesis of the two ideologies. He himself made an attempt to integrate the two ideologies.

The view of Dr. Lohia was that "socialism should cease to live on borrowed breath. Too long has it borrowed from Communism its economic aims and from capitalism or the liberal age its non-economic and general aims. Unless socialism is able to disintegrate the premises on which Capitalism and Communism are founded and arrange instead its harmony of economic and general aims, it will continue to be an illogical doctrine that refuses to come of age." Again, "Socialism need not proclaim itself as Gandhian or Marxist on the one hand and as anti-Gandhian or Marxist on the other, for this would only substitute thought by charm". Dr. Lohia was not in favour of rigid philosophies. He wanted to make human thought the centre of political action.

Dr. Lohia accepted the Marxian analysis of capitalism as applied to England and Germany of his days. He also praised the denunciation of private property by Marx. He also accepted the theory of dialectical materialism as enunciated by Marx. However, he did not accept the Marxian theory of class war. His own view was that mankind has alternated between "the stabilizing of classes into castes and loosening of castes into classes." Castes represent the conservative forces of stagnation, inertia and prescriptive rights. Classes represent a dynamic force of social mobilisation. There is an internal movement between castes and classes.

Dr. Lohia criticized the Communist regime in the Soviet Union. He pointed out that while Marx gave importance to individual liberty, the same was denied to the workers in the Soviet Union. His view was that the Communists had failed to provide either bread or freedom to the people of the Soviet Union. Dr. Lohia opposed totalitarianism and monolithism prevailing in the Soviet Union. His view was that it was not possible to achieve "the victory of truth through falsehood, of health through murder, of one world through the sacrifice of national freedom and democracy through dictatorship."

The socialism of Dr. Lohia was a pragmatic one. He differed from the dogmatic and doctrinarian socialism advocated by the socialists in Europe. His view was that European socialism lacked a world outlook. To quote him, "European socialists are so much taken up with the problems of the moment, the statistical evidence and requirement of their own nations that they miss the complete view and the world view". European socialism has been gradual, constitutional and distributive and socialism in the rest of the world has been drastic and unconstitutional at times.

According to Dr. Lohia, the new concept of socialism should not lean either on the right or on the left. It should be based on the theory that both capitalism and Communism are not relevant for creating a new civilisation. He wanted socialism to become cohesive, powerful and mighty because otherwise it was likely to be assimilated in one system or the other. He did not like socialism to live on borrowed breath. He wanted it to arrange its own harmony of economic and general aims.

The view of Dr. Lohia was that through the Gandhian technique of Satyagraha and complete decentralisation in the economic and political spheres, the economic objectives of Marxism can be achieved. If socialism absorbs the essence of Gandhism, it can become a dynamic force. The socialists should adopt the Gandhian technique of Satyagraha to fight against social injustice and to achieve their social and economic objectives. He himself adopted the Gandhian technique of civil disobedience for the vindication of the rights and dignity of the common man. However, Dr. Lohia did not believe in Gandhiji's technique of appealing to the heart of the opponent in order to convert him to one's point of view by self-suffering. Like Gandhiji, Dr. Loha was in favour of small-scale industries and small machines as they provided a remedy against capitalist concentration of employment. However, modern technology should be employed in small-scale industries. Dr. Lohia also approved of Gandhiji's technique of non-violence and himself condemned the Socialist Ministry of Travancore-Cochin as it ordered firing on violent demonstrators. Dr. Lohia also advocated economic decentralisation.

Dr. Lohia was in favour of a new brand of socialism in which emphasis was to be put on maximum attainable equality towards which nationalisation of economy may be one necessary step, a decent standard of living throughout the world, world parliament elected on adult suffrage leading to world Government, collective and individual practice of civil disobedience, freedom of the individual against unjust encroachments of public authority and securing an area of free speech and association and private life over which no Government organisation may exercise control and the evolution of a technology consistent with these aims and processes. The view of Dr. Lohia was that such a socialism alone could save the world from the sloth of Asia and strife of Europe and give humanity a new civilization of tranquil activity. Dr. Lohia stood for nationalisation as an important remedy, although not the sole remedy, for the ills of society. Dr. Lohia stood for socialism but he was not prepared to sacrifice the individual.

Dr. Lohia neither advocated the abolition of state nor its glorification. He would put restraints on the authority of the state in the interests of the individuals. He was against the concentration of power in the hands of a few. He was against state absolutism as advocated by Austin or Hobbes. Like the Pluralists, he was opposed to the concept of a monistic state. To quote him, "The sovereign power must not reside alone in certain federating units. It must be broken up and diffused over the smallest region where a group of men and women live." The pluralism of Dr. Lohia was different from that of MacIver, Dr. Figgis, Krabbe and Maitland who were the advocates of group rights. His pluralism was similar to the pluralism of Prof. Laski who stood for safeguarding the rights of individual liberty.

To quote Dr. Lohia, "Any recognition of popular sovereignty would be fictitious that does not simultaneously provide for the sharing of the state power at various levels and direct participation in administration." However Dr. Lohia did not put the state on the same footing with other organisations. To quote him, "The state is an organisation which one must compulsorily join." It must be admitted that the views of Dr. Lohia on socialism did not become popular and did not enable him to find a prominent place among the socialists of the world like Marx.

Dr. N. C. Mehrotra writes, "Dr. Lohia was not only a politician but also a philosopher having his own thinking, a social reformer pressing to the end caste system and social discrimination and to improve the lot of women, Adivasis and backward communities; an economist suggesting a number of schemes for the economic progress of an under-developed country." (Lohia, a Study, p. 56).

JAYAPRAKASH NARAYAN (1902-1979)

In the words of Ram Chandra Gupta, Jayaprakash Narayan was a dedicated and kindly individual, a man of the common people who incessantly worked for their upliftment and drew inspiration from them. His gentle manners and an unostentatious and simple look could easily command sympathy and affection of the Indian masses. Since he attained maturity, all his activities and writings exhibited his deep concern not only for the freedom of the Indian people but also for the freedom of man everywhere. The freedom of man signified to him freedom of the human personality, freedom of the mind and freedom of the spirit. This freedom he never thought of sacrificing either for the sake of bread or for position, power and security or for anything else. His passion for it could never be dimmed under the stress of any set of circumstances. Although there was a change in his political thinking from time to time, every change reflected his deeper and greater concern for the downtrodden people of India. He never liked to have any power. In fact any power or position was too small for his "multi-dimensional and epoch-making personality." He virtually represented the hopes and aspirations of the people of India and wielded the real power in the country particularly after 1970. (J.P.: From Marxism to Total Revolution, p. 1).

Jayaprakash Narayan was born on 11 October, 1902 in the family home at Sitabdiara village on the confluence of the Ganga and the Ghagra rivers on Bihar border with the United Provinces. He was a serious child burdened with an early sense of responsibility due to the tragic death of his eldest brother. Most of his time was spent in reading. By the age of 10, he was reading historical novels, glorifying the kings and heroes of ancient India. He read about foreign national heroes like Garibaldi and de Valera. All this aroused feelings of nationalism in him. He was sent to Patna to enter the Patna College school at the age of 11 or 12. He was an outstanding student. He passed his Matriculation Examination in the First Division and got a Government scholarship. One day less than a month before his I.Sc. examination was due to begin, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad and Jawaharlal Nehru addressed a public meeting at Patna. Almost all the leading students in the Patna College resolved to quit their classes from that day Jayaprakash Narayan was one of them. He was persuad-

ed to take the examination from the Bihar Vidyapeeth but he refused to join the Banaras Hindu University because it received a grant from the Government.

In 1922, he left for the United States for continuing his studies. There he had to work very hard for his studies and livelihood. He worked on plantations, on farms, washing dishes and as a waiter. He believed in dignity of labour and practised the same. He wanted to go to Moscow but could not do so on account of his continued sickness for 5 months. His thesis for his M.A. examination was on "Social Variations". He was in every sense a scholar in the making. He had just decided to go in for Ph. D. when he had to come back to India on account of the serious illness of his mother. He came back home on 23 November, 1929 after spending 7 years in the United States.

When Jayaprakash Narayan returned to India, Gandhiji was preparing for the next phase of the struggle for Independence. Jayaprakash Narayan was as impatient as Subhas Chandra Bose and Jawaharlal Nehru to fight and capture power from the British. He went to Gandhiji's Ashram at Wardha where Prabhavati, his wife, had been living for 7 years during his absence from India. Gandhiji and JP travelled together from Wardha to attend the Lahore session of the Congress in December 1929 which was presided over by Jawaharlal Nehru. On 31 December 1929, the Congress passed a resolution for complete Independence.

Jawaharlal Nehru liked JP and offered him a paid job in the Labour Research Bureau of the All India Congress Committee office at Allahabad, That brought the two leaders together and JP called Jawaharlal Nehru as his "Bhai" (brother). Both Nehru and JP went to Bombay in December 1931 to receive Gandhiji who was coming back from England and attend a meeting of the Congress Working Committee. Nehru was arrested but JP was able to avoid arrest by dressing himself as a Parsee. After the arrest of Nehru, JP became the Acting General Secretary of the Congress in 1932. In that capacity, he visited various parts of India to continue the civil disobedience movement. He was arrested on 7 December, 1932.

His first jail term in Nasik proved a landmark in his life. Among those detained at Nasik with JP were Asoka Mehta, Minoo Masani, Achyut Patwardhan, N. G. Goray and M. L. Dantwala. They had nothing to do except the discussion of politics and out of those discussions emerged the concept of a Congress Socialist Party pledged to infuse the freedom movement with socialist ideals.

When JP was released from jail, he found that the Congress Party had turned to constitutionalism and the parliamentary path. He and his colleagues had reservations about the constructive programme of Mahatma Gandhi. They felt that it was necessary to organise the workers and peasants on class lines and bring them into the freedom movement. Those who thought alike met together at Patna and Bombay in 1934 and thus the Congress Socialist Party was started with JP as its General Secretary. The main dispute between the Congress Socialist Party and the Communist Party at that time was that while the leaders of the Congress Socialist Party regarded the Indian National Congress as the anti-imperialist national front and believed that all Socialists, Marxists and Leftists

should work through the Indian National Congress, the leaders of the Communist Party of India regarded the Congress as a bourgeois party and denounced Mahatma Gandhi as a bourgeois leader. As JP was both a socialist and a nationalist, he tried his best to win both the Communists and the Congressmen for creating a broad socialist front to fight imperialism. He wanted to win over the Communists towards his views and to work together. At its Meerut session in January 1936, the Congress Socialist Party proclaimed itself as a Marxist party and invited the Bolsheviks to join its ranks. The Bolsheviks were hostile to it from the beginning and refused to acknowledge it as a Marxist or Socialist Party. They maintained that the Congress Socialist Party was a leftist fringe of "bourgeois reformists" and camp-followers of Gandhiji. However, on account of the rise of Fascism in Europe, the Communist International called for a united front of bourgeois democrats, revisionist socialists and the genuine Marxist parties. The Communist Party of India was rebuked for standing apart from the national movement. The result was that the Indian Communists began to talk about a National Democratic Front to fight imperialism. The members of the Communist Party of India began to trickle into the Congress Socialist Party. E.M.S. Namboodiripad, A. K. Gopalan, P. Sundarayya, P. Ramamurthy, Z. A. Ahmed, Batlivala and several others became its members. Four of them were co-opted as members of the Working Committee of the Congress Socialist Party.

However, the relationship between the Communists and the Congress Socialist Party could not be maintained for long. There was always the suspicion that the Communists would try to gain control of the Congress Socialist Party. Outside the meetings of the Congress Socialist Party, the Communists referred to it as a "bourgeois" appendage. There were clashes between the two, particularly on ideological matters. At first, JP tried for an understanding between the two. However, when he was threatened by Masani, Patwardhan, Lohia and Kamladevi Chattopadhyaya that they would withdraw from the party, JP admitted that the alliance with the Communists had not worked well. When the World War II started, the attitude of the Communist Party hardened into opposition. It labelled the Congress Socialist Party as a counter-revolutionary party. The Forward Bloc of Subhas Chandra Bose and the Indian National Congress were castigated as lackeys of British imperialism. At the Ramgarh session of the Congress in 1940, the Communists were unanimously expelled from the Congress Socialist Party.

In 1936, JP published a book entitled "Why Socialism ?". It contained a comprehensive review of his political and economic thinking at that time. He defended the Soviet experiment in the belief that "Russia seems most anxious to avoid centralisation of economic control. The country has already been divided into autonomous geographical units of production with autonomous freedom and full creative initiative." "Let not the Russians' mistake blind us to their great achievements, to the lessons they are teaching".

JP identified politics with power politics. To quote him, "When the state is in your hands, you can legislate, you can use the whole magnificent apparatus of propaganda and education that modern science has made available ; you can enforce your will. If there is resistance, you can use

the coercive power of the state—the police and the army—to crush it. Behind every piece of legislation, lies the state power to persuade and ultimately to coerce. No party in the world today can build socialism unless it has the machinery of the state in its hands." The programme he suggested to achieve economic freedom and to end exploitation was entirely Marxist. The remedy he proposed was state ownership and control. He made no distinction between "socialisation" and "state control." He condemned modern cities. The villages should be transformed from clusters of houses cut off from the world, into progressive communities, connected with the rest of the world with electricity, railways, telephones, radios, roads and buses. The village was to become an individual unit of production like the city.

JP was arrested on 7 March 1940 for making a seditious speech at a strike meeting of the workers at Jamshedpur on 18 February 1940. He pleaded guilty to the charge in the court but told the English judge that he was merely fulfilling a patriotic duty by impeding the efficient prosecution of the war. JP had to spend about 9 months in jail. Gandhiji condemned the Government for the arrest of JP.

After completing the sentence of 9 months in jail, JP contacted both Gandhiji and Subhas Chandra Bose and apprised them of his plan of living and working in hiding against British Government. He went to Bihar to uphold and support the peasant movement. From Bihar, he travelled to Uttar Pradesh, Gujarat and then to Bombay. All this was done by him in disguise but he was soon arrested. He was first kept in the Deoli Camp jail and then transferred to Hazaribagh Central Jail in Bihar.

JP was in Hazaribagh jail when the All-Inda Congress Committee passed the Quit India Resolution on 8 August 1942. During the night of 9 November 1942, JP escaped from Hazaribagh jail with five comrades by scaling down the prison walls. He reached Banaras and contacted the local Congress leaders. He went to Delhi. He also travelled in disguise by train around the country including Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta. He met old friends, addressed groups and made people feel that the revolt was still alive. JP and Lohia organised the Azad Dasta near Bihar's border with Nepal. However, JP was caught on 19 September 1943 when he was going by the Frontier Mail from Amritsar to Lahore.

JP was released from Agra Central Jail on 11 April 1946. He opposed the Cabinet Mission scheme when it was placed before the All India Congress Committee in July 1946. He opposed the Congress decision to take part in the Constituent Assembly. He refused to be a member of the Constituent Assembly.

In March 1948, the members of the Congress Socialist Party left the Indian National Congress. Between 1948 and 1951, both JP and Lohia worked hard to strengthen the Socialist Party. However, when the elections were held in 1952, the Socialist Party did not do well and JP was blamed for the failure of the party. In June 1952, he arranged an alliance between the Socialist Party and the Kisan Mazdoor Praja Party and thus the Praja Socialist Party came into existence.

In 1953, an effort was made to bring together the Praja Socialist

Party of which JP was soul and the Indian National Congress of which Jawaharlal Nehru was the soul. However, negotiations failed as a majority of the socialist leaders were not prepared for any compromise with the Congress.

The Bodh Gaya Sarvodaya Sammelan of 1953 profoundly influenced the mind of JP. JP was very much impressed by the Bhoodan movement of Vinoba Bhave. He was convinced that the philosophy of Bhoodan was the first step towards a total revolution—social, political and economic. He was also tired of the bickerings and jealousies in the Praja Socialist Party. The result was that on 19 April, 1954, JP resigned from the National Executive of the Praja Socialist Party. Thereafter he left party politics altogether and denounced party system. Thus, JP took to Sarvodaya which he called People's Socialism. He became an advocate of partyless democracy and decentralisation. He denounced material civilisation based on advanced technology and economic centralisation.

However, after 20 years of wilderness in Sarvodaya, JP took to active politics in 1974. He was opposed to the authoritarian rule of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. He first helped the students of Gujarat in their agitation against the Government of Gujarat. The result was that the Gujarat Ministry fell and new elections were held in which the Janata Morcha came out successful and a Janata ministry was formed in Gujarat.

JP also led the people of Bihar against the Congress ministry. He led many demonstrations in one of which he was severely beaten. There were demonstrations not only at Patna and Gaya but also at Delhi. He was also able to bring together the Opposition parties such as the Jan Sangh, Lok Dal, the Socialist Party and Congress (O). He led the agitation for the resignation of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi after her election was set aside by the Allahabad High Court on 12 June, 1975. Emergency was declared in the country and JP was arrested in the morning of 26 June, 1975 in New Delhi. He was released from detention on 12 November, 1975 when his health caused grave anxiety. During the Emergency, the Opposition parties agreed to form a united front against Mrs. Indira Gandhi and thus the Janata Party was formed. On 18 January, 1977, Mrs. Indira Gandhi declared that elections to Lok Sabha will be held in March 1977. Under the leadership of JP, the Janata Party fought the electitons and won. JP played an important part in the formation of the Janata Ministry in March 1977. The leaders of the Janata Party failed to pull together. Charan Singh left the Janata Party and the Janata Ministry fell in July 1979. JP had very poor health. The fall of the Janata Government hasttened his end and he died at Patna on 8 October, 1979.

JP on Democracy

JP was truly a democrat. He put emphasis on the moral foundations of democracy. To quote him, "The problem of democracy is basically and above all a moral problem. Unless the moral and spiritual qualities of the people are appropriate, the best constitutions and political systems will not make democracy work." His view was that certain conditions were essential for the successful working of democracy and those were a sense of duty or responsibility, faith in human equality, abhorrence of vio-

lence, toleration for the opinions of others, love for truth and liberty and the courage to resist oppression and ability to lead a simple life.

JP had so much faith in individual freedom that he criticised both centralisation of political and economic authority and statism. His view was that too much of centralisation was opposed to individual freedom and democracy. Industrialisation on a large scale and the emergence of the concept of a welfare state led to excessive centralisation. To quote him, "Large-scale production was profitable to the money-makers, the dominant class in society and their will had to be done. Governments also, irrespective of ideologies, preferred centralised big scale production because that was necessary for war-making.. because it also concentrated great economic and therefore political power in their hands". The remedy suggested by JP for centralisation was the establishment of self-governing and self-sufficient village communities.

JP also pointed out that the working of parliamentary democracy had a very narrow base. He demanded the active participation of the people in the management of public affairs and that alone could make the Government broad-based. He pointed out that the people in India did not take part in the formulation and implementation of the policy of the Government. He wanted that individuals be grouped in communities which alone could serve as strong and stable foundation for democracy. He suggested the recreation of village industries as a political unit enjoying the largest possible measure of self-Government.

JP also pointed out the defect in the existing legislative assemblies. The prevalence of the single-member constituency system resulted in the election of a person who may not have secured an absolute majority in the election. He maintained that the Indian National Congress succeeded in forming the Government both at the Centre and in the States even when it had failed to capture even 50 per cent of the votes cast. The result was that minority Governments came into power. In a reply to Mrs. Indira Gandhi, J. P. observed. "The fact that a party getting only 32 percent of the polled votes has been able to secure majority in the Assembly proves the utter defectiveness of our electoral system."

JP also pointed out that political parties were playing a dirty game in the working of democracy in India. The political parties were always after capturing power and using the same for personal or partisan interests. Once the people were elected, they tried to entrench themselves in the legislature. Political parties encouraged insincerity and hollowness.

JP also maintained that party system leads to the rise of demagoguery. Parties resort to immoral means to secure votes. They sow the seeds of dissensions and exaggerate differences. They make elections expensive and wasteful. They try to hoodwink the masses in the name of casteism, linguism and provincialism. They misguide the people. The party system seeks "to reduce the people to the position of sheep whose only function of sovereignty would be to choose periodically the shepherds who would look after their welfare."

In December 1973, JP stated in the course of his inaugural address to the All India Radical Humanist Conference at Calcutta that "Party demo-

cracy, that is, democracy based on a system manipulated by political parties is a most unsatisfactory and defective system of democracy. The people, by and large, are fed up with all political parties and the present form and practice of democracy".

JP maintained that the parliamentary democracy in India was not a rule of the people. Addressing a meeting at Ahmedabad on 17 January 1975, JP observed, "Democracy in India is in great danger particularly so after the 1971 Lok Sabha elections. The problems of the poor and the vast multitude of the people have remained unsolved. Those who have been governing the country have failed to achieve anything tangible. Instead of Garibi Hatao, Garibi Badhao has become the order of the day."

It is pointed out that although JP was conscious of the defects of party system, he was mainly responsible for the creation of the Janata Party which fought the elections in March 1977 and won. JP is stated to have observed that "if the (Bihar) movement had been confined to the Sarvodaya workers alone and its principle was to keep away all political parties including the ruling party, it would have been possible to keep them away. But, then, there would have been no people's movement". JP was asked whether the involvement of the political parties in a Bihar type people's movement was an unmixed evil or not and his reply was: "My unhesitating answer is No. Its first result too obvious to be argued is that it lends strength to the movement."

Transformation of Society

The view of JP is that the existing form of society is complex and top-heavy. It is a haven for bureaucrats, managers and technocrats. It cannot be a home for brothers to live together as brothers. According to JP, the existing social system is not suitable for establishing real socialism. To quote him, "Self-government, self-management, mutual cooperation and sharing equality, freedom, brotherhood—all could be practised and developed far better if men lived in small communities. Man is a product both of nature and culture. For his balanced growth, it is necessary that a harmonious blend between the two is effected. This blending of nature and culture is possible only in comparatively smaller communities". For establishing such a type of society, JP relied upon a non-violent social revolution.

The entire emphasis of JP, whether directly or indirectly, was on the establishment of self-Government in the country in the true sense of the term which he often called "participating democracy". The politics of party and power had gone on a long way to vulgarise democracy and defeat its sublime values of human freedom, equality and cooperation. JP put forward the idea of politics of Sarvodaya. The politics of Sarvodaya shall have no party and hence no worry for power. Its aim will be "to see that all centres of power are abolished". Under the politics of Sarvodaya, the realisation of the dream of withering away of the state may be made possible.

JP made self-governing and self-sufficing village communities as the foundation of participating democracy. The family could be a primary unit but it is too small a unit to live by itself. Hence a number of families join together and form a village or local community. Swaraj can be a

reality for the people only if Government is brought near them. Hence a vigorous system of local self-Government enabling the villages to govern the local people is the crying need of the hour. JP appreciates the introduction of Panchayati Raj with its three tiers, the Gram or Village Panchayat, the Block Panchayat Samiti and Zila Parishad. However, the Panchayati Raj as introduced in some of the states does not come up to his expectations. One defect in the existing system is that it draws its powers and strength from the Government above and not from the residents within. They seem to be an imposition from above. They appear to be an extension of the bureaucratic rule. JP suggests that village Panchayats should be the basis of true democracy and the vehicle of local Self-Government. The Gram Sabha should be made the "bottom tier, the ground floor of the noble edifice of democracy". The Gram Sabha will be composed of all adults—men and women—residing in the village. It will be convened once in four months and even oftener to discuss all matters which affect the life of the village and arrive at decisions. It will pass the budget of the village. The Gram Panchayat will function as its executive organ and be responsible to it. It will be constituted on a non-party basis. The decisions will be unanimous. In case of differences of opinion, matter will be decided by lots. The party system and election by majority vote is to be avoided at all costs. The political parties should place themselves under a self-denying ordinance and keep away from the local bodies. To quote JP, "The local institution of peoples' self-government must rise from below and be susceptible not only to the thoughts, desires and needs of the people, but also to their direct control."

According to JP, if Panchayati Raj is to serve the basis of a true participating democracy, certain conditions must be fulfilled. The first essential condition is the education of the people. To quote JP, "This education can best be imparted by dis-interested, non-partisan agencies, engaged in social service or tasks of rural development. Political parties might also make a great contribution in this respect, provided they address themselves to the task in a non-partisan spirit. Pehaps the best way for them would be to create a common agency through which to carry on this work. Government officers and agencies might also do useful work in this sphere. Schools, libraries, and cooperative societies have an important role to play here. There might also be centres jointly set up and conducted by the Union Ministry of Community Development, the All-India Panchayat Parishad, other all-India local self-Government organisations, the Akhil Bharat Serva Seva Sangh and other national rural service agencies. Such a centre could help by way of producing literature, conducting surveys, studying problems etc."

Another essential condition for the success of Panchayati Raj is non-interference with it by the political groups. The political parties must refrain from trying "to convert it into their hand-maiden and using it as a jumping ground to climb to power". The parties might be allowed to some extent to carry on educative work among the people. For the sake of health and vitality of these institutions and intelligent participation of the people in the working of democracy, it would be best to leave these institutions in the direct control of the people without any party interference. To quote JP, "If the leaders of all the political parties came to

rent villages within the same region and between various states of the Indian Union. He suggested the settnig up of regional, state and all-India industries. To quote him, "A decentralised economy must aim at relating full utilisation of local and regional resources, human and material, to the satisfaction of local and regional needs. For this regional surveying and planning would be necessary. This would, further, assume that for production and consumption of different commodities, different areas would serve as economic units so that there might be some industries that are village industries, some that are block area industries, others that are district, state or union industries. This does not mean, however, that surpluses from one area would not be exchanged for surpluses of other areas but it does mean that by and large, for each type of industry, the area covered would be the geographical zone within which it would operate." This new economy involved planning but it was planning from below and not from above. The structure suggested by JP appears to be similar to that of Vinoba Bhave. However, there is one basic difference. According to Vinoba Bhave, the higher authorities were to exercise only advisory and moral authority which was expected to cease in the long run. The view of JP is that "just as in its internal administration, the primary community is autonomous, so in the spheres in which the primary communities have delegated their powers to the regional community, the latter is autonomous".

To begin with, JP advocated the state ownership of the means of production, distribution and exchange and planning was to usher in socialism. However, JP took to Sarvodaya to assure economic security, equality and freedom from exploitation to citizens. He refused to give too much importance to the authority of the state. To quote him, "The experience of totalitarian countries has shown that if the state is looked upon as the sole agent of social transformation, we get nothing but a regimented society in which the state is all-powerful and popular initiative is extinct and the individual is made a cog in a vast inhuman machine. Democracy requires that the people should depend as little as possible on the state and both according to Mahatma Gandhi and Karl Marx, the highest stage of democracy is that in which the state has withered away". Vinoba Bhave stood for a stateless society but JP was not willing that the state may completely wither away. While Vinoba Bhave was a philosophical anarchist, JP was a realistic anarchist. However, JP entertained a hope that Sarvodaya politics may lead to the abolition of all centres of power. To quote him, "The more this new politics grows, the more the old politics shrinks. A real withering away of the state."

Partyless Democracy

While examining the working of parliamentary democracy in India, JP criticized the role of the political parties. His view was that the people were fed up with all political parties which were responsible for many evils in society. The parties gave an impetus to the politics of power and encouraged the use of unfair and unscrupulous means to win elections. They debased politics. They generated and accentuated differences between neighbours. They sowed seeds of dissensions. Their role was divisive. They reduced the people to the position of sheep whose only

function was to choose periodically the shepherds to look after their welfare. The candidates for elections were chosen by the political parties and not by the people and they were given a limited alternative to vote for one or the other candidate. When a person was declared elected, he showed allegiance to the political party which nominated him and not to the people who cast their votes in his favour. With the growth of the political parties, there was a deterioration in the status and prestige of the voters.

In order to avoid these defects, JP advocated the establishment of participating democracy which involved immediate contact between the Government and the people. It appeared to him that that was possible only if there was decentralisation of authority and the abolition of political parties. JP visited many foreign countries like England, France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Switzerland, Belgium, Greece, Yugoslavia etc. and came to the conclusion that party system was not desirable and hence he advocated the idea of parytless democracy.

JP advocated the establishment of village Panchayats whose members were to be elected on the basis of unanimity and not by a majority of votes. The village Panchayats were to elect members of Block Panchayats who in turn were to elect members of Zila Panchayats who in turn were to elect members of Provincial Panchayats who in turn were to elect members of Central Panchayat. The view of JP was that in such a system there was no necessity of political parties. The things were to be done on the principles of community consensus and unanimity. The members were to lead dedicated lives. The existing parties were to be invited to cooperate and work unitedly for Sarvodaya. After the establishment of Sarvodaya Samaj, all political parties were to disappear. People may contest elections on party basis but the moment legislatures came into existence, the feeling of belonging to a party must end. The parties must stop functioning. The members of the legislature should vote according to their conscience. The Ministers were not to be chosen on party basis. The members of the legislature were to submit a list of names giving their preferences and the persons securing the highest preferences were to become ministers.

Critics point out that although the idea of partyless democracy seems to be attractive, it cannot be put into actual practice. It is not possible to elect the members of the Provincial and Central Panchayats on the basis of unanimity. If unanimity is required for anything, it may be found impossible to achieve the same in actual practice and that may stand in the way of the progress of the country. JP wanted to neutralise political parties but it may be an impossible task to accomplish.

It is also contended that JP ignored altogether the useful part played by political parties and merely emphasized their defects. It is pointed out that without political parties, democracy is like a boat without rudder and a ship without a pilot. Party system has proved to be an asset in the working of democracy. If there are no political parties in the national sphere, local politics may dominate and national problems may be ignored. That would be a suicidal policy. The abolition of all parties may prove to be a greater evil by disallowing even genuine differences to crop up. Morris Jones criticises party-less democracy of JP in these

words: "At the end of the streets labelled, mass participation and identity of interests, there stand the ugly figures of tyranny and conformity".

Later on, JP himself realised that it was practically impossible to run a democratic system of Government without the existence of political parties. He himself was mainly responsible for the creation of the Janata Party which fought the elections in 1977 and won. JP himself admitted that without the help of political parties, there would have been no people's movement.

However, JP made certain suggestions for the better working of parliamentary democracy. He advocated the creation of a strong and viable opposition. His view was that an effective opposition could be developed if political parties, in spite of their contradictory ideologies and personal ambitions and interests of their leaders, were bound together in a viable manner. Such an opposition could play a constructive role. In order to stop floorcrossing by elected members, JP advocated that the people should have the right to recall a person who had been elected by them if he gave up his political party and joined another. However, such a change is likely to result in chaos in politics. JP also recommended that the Election Commission should consist of persons of great integrity like the Judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts who should be selected by a Board consisting of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of India, the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. He also advocated the lowering of the age of voters to 18 years. He also suggested that the use of money in elections and the display of caste and communal considerations should be stopped. The social system should be transformed and chances of exploitation be removed. JP was of the view that in order to strengthen democracy, there should be "free enlightened citizenry jealous of its rights and conscious of duties, an independent judiciary and watchful legislature, a free press, a balanced party system, vigilant and effective public opinion, a free academic community, powerful trade unions and associations of different sectors of society".

JP as a Socialist

It is well-known that even as a student in the United States, JP became a Marxist. He was influenced not only by the writings of Marx but also those of M. N. Roy. He was very much impressed by the philosophy of revolution advocated by Marx. He came to believe that the cult of revolution advocated by Marx was a sure means to bring about independence for India. He was impressed by the achievements of the Soviet Union under Lenin. He was also impressed by the feelings of equality and brotherhood preached by the Marxists.

It is true that JP became a Marxist, but he was not a blind admirer of all that was happening in the Soviet Union. He did not approve of the atrocities committed by the Bolshevik Party in the Soviet Union. He was in favour of forging a united front of the socialists in India and the Communist Party of India but he had to part company with the Communists in 1940 on account of their activities within the Congress Socialist Party. On the question of Tibet, he condemned the imperialistic designs of the Chinese Communists. He did not approve of the attitude adopted by

the Communist Party of India towards Gandhiji who was described by them as a lackey of the buorgeoisie in India. The Communists also called the nationalist movement in India as a bourgeois movement. He found that the Communist Party of India was always loyal towards Russia and not towards India. The result was that JP was alienated from the Soviet Union. This made him change his ideology from Marxism to democratic socialism.

Accoding to JP, the socialist way of life is a way of sharing together the good things that common endeavour may make available. To quote him, "I believe that unless members of society learn to keep their wants under control, willingly sharing of things may be difficult, if not impossible and society was bound to split into two divisions: (1) Comprising those who are trying to discipline others and (2) Comprising all the rest. Such a division of society always leaves the question open: who would discipline the disciples, rule the rulers? The only solution seems to be to restrict as much as possible the need and area of disciplining from above by ensuring that every member of society practises self-discipline and the values of socialism, and among other things, willingly shares and cooperates with his fellow men."

As a socialist, JP attached great importance to the economic problems of the country and the necessity of solving them as early as possible. According to him, "The root cause of inequalities of wealth lies in the fact that the gifts of nature which yield wealth to men and the instruments of production have come to be privately owned by people for their own benefit. These lead to economic exploitation in the withholding from the workers of all that they produce except what they need to live on at a given standard of living". JP did not attribute inequalities among human beings to biological causes. His view was that inequalities arose because the means of production were owned by a few and that led to concentration of wealth and exploitation of others. Hence, JP advocated the abolition of private property and private ownership. His view was that all the means of production should become the property of the state. He wanted the banks, transport and trade to be nationalised.

JP emphasized the fact that the state must satisfy the basic needs of the people because without them, there could be no cultural progress. To quote him, "Economic minimum is a prime pre-condition for the resplendence of the culture".

The view of JP was that the machinrey of the state was necessary for building a socialistic super-structure. To quote him, "Those who desire to construct a socialistic society should have the power and the requisite sanction behind them to do so. When a state is in your hands, you can legislate; you can use the whole magnificent apparatus of propaganda and education that modern science has made available. Behind every piece of legislation lies the state's power to persuade and ultimately to coerce".

As a socialist, JP had great sympathy for the peasants who were terribly suffering in many ways. He stood for a transformation of society in such a way that the sufferings of the people living in the villages could be removed. He wanted the villages to be self-sufficient. He suggested radical changes in the laws relating to land. He suggested cooperative farming. To quote him, "The only solution is to clear away all vested interests that lead in any manner whatsoever to the exploitation of the tiller of

the soil; liquidate all agrarian debts ; pool the holdings and establish corporate and collective farming." Again, "Socialism in agriculture i.e., cooperative and collective farming is essential for the success of any attempt to recast Indian life on a socialist basis. Socialism can never go with millions of peasants owning their own patches of land, cultivating them for their own profit". JP suggested collective farming as the next step to cooperative farming. In collective farming, "No individual holding remains and the basis of distribution is only the amount of labour put in and in some unusual cases, unusual needs. Even in the collective village, individual ownership of tools may yet remain and pigs and cattle and horse may yet be the property of the individuals".

As regards the ways and means to establish socialism, JP did not advocate the use of violence as preached by the Marxists. He preferred to follow the Gandhian method of non-violence. He agreed with Gandhiji that the purity of means was very important for achieving a good end. At the Nasik Conference of the Congress Socialist Party held in March 1948, JP observed, "There were many things that Mahatma Gandhi taught us. But the greatest thing he taught us was that means are ends, that evil means can never lead to good ends and that fair ends require fair means. Nothing but good means will enable us to reach the goal of a good society which is socialism".

With the passage of time, there was a change in the views of JP. He found that socialism did not yield the values which were cherished by him. Those values were freedom, equality, brotherhood and peace. At the Sarvodaya Sammelan held at Bodh Gaya in 1953, JP came to the conclusion that socialism must be transformed to Sarvodaya if the ideals of freedom, equality, brotherhood and peace were to be achieved. The result was that he himself became a Jeevandani. He felt that it was not necessary to give too much power to the state to achieve socialism. Socialism could be achieved through Sarvodaya and Sarvodaya became a new brand of socialism which was suited to the needs of the people.

Sarvodaya

In 1954, JP left the Socialist Party and joined the Bhoodan movement of Vinoba Bhave. He decided to give his whole life to the new cause. He found that the state was like a Leviathan which interfered with the freedom of the people. He found in Sarvodaya a true way to socialism. To quote him, "The remedy is to create and develop forms of socialist living through the voluntary endeavour of the people rather than seek to establish socialism by the use of the power of the state". JP advocated the substitution of people's socialism for state socialism. He wanted socialism to be achieved by the people themselves and not through the agency of the state. Bands of selfless workers were to live and work among the people and help them to re-organise their lives in such a way that they became self-reliant. He suggested decentralisation of power in order to put a check on the authority of the state.

JP became a votary of the Bhoodan movement started by Vinoba Bhave. About Bhoodan, JP said, "To superficial observers, Bhoodan is just an agrarian reform movement. To those who have looked deep, it is a far more significant movement. It is the beginning of an all-round

social and human revolution—human also because it aims at changing men alongwith society. It is an application on a general scale of Mahatma Gandhi's non-violent technique of revolution". JP explained his concept of Gram Raj in these words: "A Gram Raj is a self-governing village, a village republic, not merely a Panchayat. The Gram Raj is to be built up by the villagers themselves by their own initiative and not by the governmental agencies".

JP stood for a social system which was not a haven for bureaucrats, managers, technocrats and statists. In his concept of socialist society, there was to be self-Government, self-management, mutual cooperation, equality, freedom and brotherhood. There were to be no party politics. To quote him, "We are neither for nor against any particular party. We desire a polity without parties. The ideals of Sarvodaya are close to those of socialism and communism though we stress the independence and power of the common people—we stress the decentralisation of economic and political power so that it resides in collective oganisation of the people." The view of JP was that a socialist society was possible only in small communities where the people live together as equals and help one another.

The view of JP was that there should be not only decentralisation of authority, but there should also be economic decentralisation. That could be possible under a system of Panchayati Raj in which the people took active part in the working of the administration. JP writes, "Power as I have tried to show cannot be developed nor administration decentralised if (a) there were no institutions and centres of self-Govenment below the present state level and (b) all the different levels of Government were not organically or structurally integrated together so that the higher level draws its support and authority from the lower ones and the whole structure rested ultimately upon the broad base of the Gram Sabhas comprising the entire adult population of the country.

Sarvodaya detests Rajniti or power politics. It shuns party system and representative democracy. It stands for partyless democracy which can be realised through the inculcation of community spirit by the establishment of Panchayats and launching of Bhoodan and Gramdan movements. The society is to be free from the malady of parties and elections on party basis. All the good and honest people in the country have to be united on one front to carry out an agreed programme. The party spirit is to be discarded. The feeling has to be given up that a member of a legislature belongs to a particular party and has to act according to its dictates. Power is to be decentralised politically and economically. The people have to work in a spirit of cooperation and keep an eye on the village officials so that they may not become corrupt.

Sarvodaya stands for the happiness and elevation of all. It repudiates the theory of class war. It protects the rights and interests of the minority by repudiating the concept of majoritarianism. The rich are not to be deprived of their wealth forcibly. The method of a conscious and spontaneous sharing of goods is to be adopted. Through a mass moral revolution, the era of peaceful social reconstruction is to be ushered in. There is to be a peaceful revolution in every sphere.

Sarvodaya stands for the consensus principle and not the acceptance of the majority view. Through discussions and debates, arguments and

counter-auguments, mutual goodwill is expected to emerge. This is considered to be a more genuine method for arriving at a decision or a social action than the artificial counting of heads. Sarvodaya does not accept the view that diverse social interests give rise to different parties. Sarvodaya approves of the technique of Satyagraha. On many occasions, the enlightened conscience of even one person may be in consonance with the canons of truth and the majority view may be repugnant to it. In such cases, Satyagraha is to be resorted to by the isolated individual.

The view of JP was that Sarvodaya was to be established through a non-violent social revolution. In such a revolution, force was to be discarded and the method of persuasion was to be adopted.

In 1975, JP made certain recommendations for the improvement of the existing social order. His view was that the basic necessities of life should be provided to the weaker sections of the people. A reasonable balance should be maintained between agricultural and industrial prices. Need-based minimum wages and incomes should be guaranteed to all. Economic inequalities must be minimised. There should be an equitable redistribution of land and the payment of fair wages to agricultural labour. Highest priority should be given to the development of agriculture and rural economy. The import of luxury goods should be banned. Effective steps should be taken to raise the quality of education. Emphasis should be put on vocations in the courses for study. Highest priority should be given to reach the target of universal primary education. Efforts should be made to control corruption.

Total Revolution

Explaining his view on total revolution, JP himself wrote that he had been bitten by the bug of revolution during his high school days. It was then the bug of national revolution, national Independence. It was because of that bug that when Gandhiji gave the call for Non-cooperation, JP himself responded to it and went to the United States for higher studies. The revolution bug took him to Marxism and through the national freedom movement to democratic socialism and then to Vinobaji's non-violent revolution through love. Before joining Vinobaji, JP assured himself through discussions with him that he was concerned not with the mere redistribution of land but with a total transformation of man and society.

Having become satisfied that the Gram Swaraj movement was not capable of bringing about Ahimsak Kranti (non-violent revolution) which he and his friends had talked for about twenty years from 1954 to 1974, JP was searching for some other way. Moreover, he had tried during those years, through seminars and conferences, to bring about a change in Government policy, planning and number of other spheres including electoral reforms. All those efforts were wanted even in the time of Jawaharlal Nehru and the machinery of the state continued to work as before. JP tried to persuade Prime Minister Indira Gandhi to do something in the matter but failed. When the Bihar students' movement gathered strength and drew the sympathy and support and to some extent participation of the people, JP came to the conclusion that time had come to see its course towards total revolution.

Addressing a huge gathering of about five lacs of students at Patna on 5 June 1974, JP said, "I am putting before you a revolutionary pro-

gramme. It is total revolution. We are not here merely to see that the Vidhan Sabha is dissolved—that is only one milestone on our journey. But we have a long way to go. After 27 years of freedom, the people of this country are wrecked by hunger, rising prices, corruption. Nothing works without bribes. The people are oppressed by every kind of injustice. Our educational institutions are corrupt. The lives of thousands of young students are in ruins; they face a bleak future. Everyday unemployment rises; the slogan 'Garibi Hatao' has been uttered but Garibi mounts, the ranks of the poor are swelled. The number of the landless grows larger everyday. The small farmer is limping into penury and ruin. It is a total revolution that we want, nothing else." JP himself prepared a plan.

After the meeting of 5 June 1974, the Opposition parties involved in the movement gave their assent and total revolution came to be accepted the goal of the struggle. Slogans and songs about "Sampoorna Kranti ab Naara hai, Bhavi Itihas Hamara hai" (Total revolution is our slogan, future history belongs to us) reverberated throughout the length and breadth of Bihar. The slogan rapidly spread throughout the Hindi-speaking and Hindi-understanding states of India. The extensive tours of JP throughout the country gave him the feeling that there was a mass awakening in the country. However, he was doubtful whether it was the proper time for the Bihar movement to spread all over the country. There seemed to be a lack of leadership. As the general elections approached, the attention of the Opposition turned to the elections and the possibility of exploiting the new awakening to win the elections. JP encouraged the Opposition parties to commit themselves to a general people's struggle for comprehensive social change and to use the resulting climate to their advantage in the next elections. JP tried to bring them together either into one party or a well-knit front like the Janata Front in Gujarat. JP's interest was to use the commitment of the Opposition parties to a people's struggle to assure that in the event of their succeeding at the Centre and the States, the new Government would help and participate in the revolutionary movement. JP pointed out that since Independence, there had been no real change in the social, economic and political structure of Indian society. Zamindari was abolished. Land reform laws were passed. Untouchability was legally prohibited etc. However, the village in most parts of India was still in the grip of the higher castes and the bigger and the medium land-owners. Although the small and marginal landowners and the landless, the backward classes and the Harijans formed the majority in most states, yet their position continued to be miserable. They were cheated and exploited. Some industries, banks and life insurance companies had been nationalised. Railways were also nationalised. New large public sector industries were established. However, all that added to state capitalism and inefficiency, waste and corruption. State capitalism means more power to the state which means the state bureaucracy which is also called public bureaucracy. There is no element or trait of socialism in all this. The people have no place in it except as workers or consumers. There is no economic democracy or industrial democracy. In spite of several committees and commissions, the educational system remains basically the same as it was during the British rule. The structure of society has remained unchanged through the years since independence. The customs, manners,

beliefs and superstitions of the masses have remained much the same. Even among the classes, the change is superficial in most parts. There has been a steady decline in political, public and business morality.

JP raised the question whether the existing condition could be fundamentally changed through the ordinary democratic process or not and his reply was in the negative. He wanted to bring about a total revolution in every sphere and aspect of society. That revolution was to be peacefully brought about without impairing the democratic structure of society and affecting the democratic way of life of the people. Even the most legalistic and constitutionalist democrat would agree that all that could never be accomplished if the functioning of democracy was restricted to elections, legislation, planning and administrative execution. There must also be people's direct action. That action would almost certainly comprise, among other forms, civil disobedience, peaceful resistance and non-cooperation or Satyagraha in its widest sense. Those wanting a change must also change themselves before launching any kind of action. The aim of the movement was not only to change the Government in Bihar but also to bring about a kind of revolution. In his book entitled "Prison Diary" written during his detention in 1975, JP wrote that total revolution is a combination of seven revolutions—social, economic, political, cultural, ideological or intellectual, educational and spiritual. This number may be increased or decreased. The cultural revolution may include educational and ideological revolution. If culture is to be used in an anthropological sense, it can embrace all other revolutions. Likewise, social revolution in the Marxian context covers economic and political revolutions and even more than that. We can add to this number by breaking up each of the seven revolutions into different categories. Economic revolution may be split up into industrial, agricultural, technological revolution etc. Similiarly, intellectual revolution may be split up into scientific and philosophical revolutions. Even spiritual revolution can be viewed as made up of the moral and spiritual revolution. The technical words used in this connection must be clearly defined.

About JP's concept of total revolution, Brahmanand writes, "Total Revolution is not a dogma but an attitude to life. It is not a revolution in the sense of a sudden change but it is a deep and comprehensive change in individuals and society. It is different both in its methodology and objectives. Its methodology is non-violent and peaceful. It is essentially a people's movement and not a partisans' movement aiming at a thorough social transformation in every activity of man—economics, politics, education, culture, social relations. It visualises setting up a real and effective peoples' power for the upliftment of all."

The aim of total revolution was a change at all levels and all facets of life. It was not only a political change, an economic change or an educational change, but a change in man himself. It was not a mere change of Government but a change of the system itself. "We want the entire system changed; we do not want the ruling party to be simply replaced by the Jana Sangh or the BLD". JP told the All-India Youth Conference at Allahabad on 22 June 1974, "My interest is not in the capture of power but in the control of power by the people. People now have only one right left, the right to vote. If that also is denied or falsified, what remains?

In countries where democracy has developed an infrastructure, there are many checks on those in power : the press, the academic institutions and the intellectuals. There is a strong public opinion. We have no such foundations and we will take time to develop them. I wish to give the people's movement a revolutionary direction so that the whole people can develop their own power and become the guardians of democracy."

In the political sphere, JP suggested the setting up of an autonomous institution with legal authority both at the Centre and the State. At the Centre, such an institution may be called Lokpal. Elections were to be made cheap and the representatives were to be brought nearer the people. People's committees were to be set up to act as watch-dogs so that the promises made at the time of election are not ignored.

Total revolution was also to include the reform of the electoral system with a view to strengthen democracy at the grass-roots level, to evolve a democratic machinery through which some measure of popular consultation might be possible in the nomination of candidates to ensure that the legislature fairly represents the various points of view within the electorate and to provide a machinery to ensure a measure of accountability on the part of the representatives to their constituents. JP set up a team of six persons to go into the mechanics of elections and recommended measures for electoral reform.

Economic revolution includes technological, industrial and agricultural revolutions, accompanied by a radical change in the pattern of ownership and management. It is not necessary that ownership and management always means state ownership and state management. Ownership may vest in the state, in an individual or a company of individuals, in a registered or cooperative society, or it may be a combination of all these forms. Ownership may vest in a local community such as a village assembly, an assembly of a group of villages, block level assembly, district council (Zila Parishad), or a combination of all these forms of ownership. There can be consumers' or producers' ownership and a combination of these and other patterns of ownership. JP explained the economic programme in these words : "I do think that I and my colleagues have a fair idea of the broad social, economic, political and cultural frame for the movement. This, broadly speaking, is a Gandhian frame laying emphasis on agricultural development, equitable land ownership; the application of appropriate technology to agriculture such as improved labour-intensive tools and gadgets of which the gobar (gas) plan is a fine example; the development of domestic and rural industries and the widest possible spread of small industries; regional planning and the development; political and administrative decentralisation and devolution qualitatively and materially different from the present bogus decentralisation that we have in the shape of Gram Panchayats, Panchayat Samities and Zila Parishads; drastic reforms to destroy eduction's elitist character and relate it to the problems of socio-economic development of the lives of students themselves; and the dismantling of the hierarchical caste structure of Hindu society and also the economic hierarchical structure in a manner that does not discourage production and create a privileged class of a managerial bureaucracy as we have today."

JP did not confine himself only to economic problems but also emphasized the need for social reform. He attacked the use of castes by poli-

tical parties for electoral purposes. On one occasion, he observed, "The biggest party in India is caste". JP pleaded for a change in the existing social system. He maintained that social disparities were particularly pernicious and pointed out how two persons in his own village, one of whom was a Rajput and the other Sudra, may have the same quantity of land and the same income and wealth and yet one would be "superior" to the other. At any social or public function, the Rajput would unhesitatingly go and take his seat on the Takhat or platform while the Sudra would sit on the ground without experiencing any sense of injustice. To quote him, "This kind of thing can kill socialism".

Another social evil pointed out by JP was the institution of dowry. To quote him, "If any man participating in this movement or supporting it accepts dowry on his marriage, it will be betrayal of the cause. And total revolution cannot take place in Bihar alone. The whole of Indian society has to be changed."

JP also advocated that the Harijans and the tribal people who were economically poor and socially backward, should be uplifted and brought into the main-stream of Indian community. The view of JP was that without such constructive work, total revolution will remain incomplete. He appealed to the workers in these words: "It should be the main plank of our programme to make a united effort to enthuse the people and the youth and make them fight social evils, the system of dowry, caste distinctions, practice of untouchability, religious and other differences between the communities etc."

While there had been criticism by academics and intellectuals of the existing system of education in the country, it was for the first time that the demand for the reform of the educational system in a fundamental way formed a part of a mass movement. Basically, the attack was on the present pattern of higher education for a privileged few at the cost of primary education for the large illiterate mass. The changes demanded in the educational system were that one-third or one-half of the working time in all educational institutions at all stages should be devoted to active participation in programmes of social service and national development. These should include such programmes as the liquidation of illiteracy, non-formal education of the out of school group in the age group of 15 to 25 years and the expansion of elementary and pre-school education. All teaching facilities in the community should be developed and not confined to full-time teachers. There should be programmes of part-time education, correspondence courses, encouragement of self-study programmes etc. The University degrees should be delinked from eligibility for public employment. The students should impart the rudiments of education to every citizen, young and old, residing in villages and slums of the towns. The medium of education should be made universal and illiteracy should be banished from the land. The educational programme could be summed up thus: *"Education for the masses, not only for the classes"*.

As regards the *method* for bringing about total revolution, JP repeatedly drew the attention of the people to the failure of violent revolutions to achieve their aims and gave the examples of Soviet Russia and China. Following that line of thought, JP rejected the path of violence and deceit. He preferred the peaceful method rather than the violent method. Accord-

ing to him, there had never been a non-violent social revolution anywhere in the world but there was an example of a non-violent political revolution as in the case of Gandhiji. The view of JP was that the conditions for an armed revolt did not prevail in the country. He referred to the talk of revolution in certain quarters in the name of the peasants and workers and observed that after seeing what had happened in West Bengal, Sundarayya of CPI (M) had said, "If we do not stick to non-violence, we shall be finished". It is true that Mao Tse-Tung had said that "power comes out of the barrel of the gun", but JP pointed out that the guns in China were in the hands of the People's Liberation Army and not of the peasants, workers and the common people. In any event, there was no need for violence when the movement had the support of the people.

JP advocated the formation of two kinds of Sangharsh Samitis, one involving the students and the other involving the people. The former were to be set up in every village and the higher secondary schools and the latter at the Gram Panchayat level. Pressure could be put on an MLA by his voters. The people were not to take their disputes to police stations or the courts. The Universities should be closed and examinations and classes should be boycotted. He appealed to the guardians and parents of the students to "look upon this not as an ordinary kind of movement. It is in fact the beginning of a revolution whose gains might transform the entire society."

JP was in favour of using all legitimate methods except violence. He had no objection to the use of Satyagraha for that purpose.

The view of JP was that the methods of mobilising the people available to totalitarian regimes, whether Fascist or Communist, cannot be used in a democracy. Many people feel that the only effective instrument of national reconstruction is the Government. Even granting for the sake of argument that this view is correct, it does not take us a single step forward towards the solution of our problem. The Government has failed so far to inspire the people to action. As regards political parties, they are entirely and exclusively concerned with power. Without exception, they all believe that it is only the Government that can do anything for the people and therefore they busy themselves either with the exercise of enjoyment of power or with winning of power. This sort of approach makes the people helpless. In this sense, the parties do more harm than good. Some of the Opposition parties attempt to mobilise mass action in the form of demonstrations and the like but these things teach the people that Government alone can improve their lot and therefore they must act in order to compel it to give them what they want. It is easy to stir up the masses for agitational purposes but rather difficult to persuade them to learn anything new to give up their prejudices and to work cooperatively together. In order to do this, it is necessary to go where the people are, live with them and patiently teach and help them to do what needs to be done. Whoever goes to the people must first receive himself the necessary knowledge and training. However, mere knowledge and training are not sufficient. There must also be the spirit of service and sacrifice. There must be voluntary workers with the zeal and fire of a mission

India is a vast country and the work of national reconstruction can-

not be delayed. For this, what is needed is a vast army of voluntary workers with the spirit of service and sacrifice. Gandhiji wanted such a worker for every village. Those workers must have a progamme which is very simple and can be understood by the people. Their tools and skills must also be simple. A programme for the millions cannot be such which requires much capital investment per head as capital is scarce in our country. It is in the villages of India that 80 percent of our people live and it is there that local initiative has almost completely been killed. Hence, the voluntary workers have to concentrate on the villages. Unless the villagers are driven by idealism and a sense of mission, no constructive programme can yield the desired results.

JP was a great leader and a great thinker. He was a man of integrity and lofty idealism. His heart went out to those who were suffering in any way. He was genuinely interested in solving their problems and making them happier and better citizens.

However, it is pointed out that his policy of decentralisation must weaken the Central Government and that is not in the interests of the country as a whole. Past experience shows that whenever the Central Government was weak, there were invasions of the country which resulted in untold miseries to the people. It appears that JP was conscious of this criticism and that is why he said, "A top heavy sprawling centre, poking its finger into every pie, might have the appearance of strength and power but in actual practice, it would be weak, flabby, slow-moving and ineffective. National unity or strength do not depend upon the list of subjects that a Central Government deals with, but on such intangible factors as emotional integration, common experiences and aspirations, national ethos, mutual goodwill and the spirit of accommodation and above all upon large-hearted wisdom on the part of national leaders".

It is also pointed out that the ideas of JP apply to a simple society with a rural civilization but the present society is highly complex and materialistic. It is also contended that the ideal of partyless state advocated by JP cannot be realised in actual practice. The concept of unanimity while taking decisions is not healthy. Unanimity can work as a cloak for catering to the idea of maintaining the status quo. The principle of unanimity can be a bottleneck in social change.

Critics also criticise the views of JP on the question of indirect elections. The elections to the Thana Panchayats, District Panchayats, Provincial Panchayats and the Central Panchayat are to be held indirectly. That is not considered to be a wise suggestion.

JP asked the students to leave their studies for one year and work for bringing about a total revolution in the country. It is maintained that the agitational approach advocated by JP was likely to upset harmony and lead to violence. His view of total revolution is described as "bandwagon politics". JP did not realise that there was every possibility of the students going out of control and the possibility of a danger was always there.

ASOKA MEHTA (1911-84)

Asoka Mehta was a political leader of great eminence. He was a man of integrity. He was versatile genius. He was well-known for his knowledge and

firm grasp of national and international problems. He was a socialist leader and thinker.

Asoka Mehta was born on 24 October 1911. He was educated at Bombay but his education was interrupted as he joined the freedom movement. He was one of the founder-members of the Congress Socialist Party which was started in 1934. He was a member of the National Executive of the Congress Socialist Party from 1934 to 1948. He was arrested during the Quit India Movement and detained for three years.

The Congress Socialist Party cut off its connection with the Indian National Congress in 1948 and Asoka Mehta was a member of the Socialist Party from 1948 to 1952. As a result of merger, the Praja Socialist Party came into existence in 1952 and he was its General Secretary in the beginning and Chairman from 1959 to 1963. He was the President of the Indian National Congress (O) from 1973 to 1977.

In 1949, Asoka Mehta founded the Hind Mazdoor Sabha and was its first Secretary. He was a member of Lok Sabha from 1954 to 1970. He represented India at the U.N. General Assembly in 1963. He was the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission from 1963 to 1967. He was the Leader of the Planning Commission delegation to Russia in 1965 and 1966 and the United States in 1965. In 1966, he was appointed Minister for Planning. In 1967, he was Minister for Planning, Petroleum and Chemicals and Social Welfare. He resigned in 1968.

Asoka Mehta was a great scholar. He wrote a large number of books. The names of some of them are the Communal Triangle in India (1942), Democratic Socialism (1951), Studies in Socialism (1956), India Today (1974), Reflections on the Socialist Era (1977), The Great Rebellion, The Political Mind of India, Socialism and Peasantry, Politics of Planned Economy, Perception of Asian Personality etc.

After the independence of India in 1947, Asoka Mehta was in favour of continuing the relationship of cooperation between the Congress Socialist Party and the Indian National Congress. Even when the Congress Socialist Party cut off its connection with the Congress in 1948, Asoka Mehta continued to have the same view. He was happy when the Congress adopted in 1955 at its Avadi session the goal of socialistic pattern of society. In 1953, he supported the move of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru to have cooperation from the Praja Socialist Party in his Government. Although the negotiations failed on account of opposition from Dr. Lohia and other socialist leaders, Asoka Mehta still emphasized the necessity of cooperation between the two parties. To quote him, "Even when the question of cooperation with the Government party is dropped, certain difficult questions affecting our policy of opposition remain. The economic backwardness of India exerts inescapable compulsions on our policies. In an under-developed economy, there is always the danger of democratic and secular policy getting discredited because of the failure of a party like the Congress. The difficulty can be met by one of the two alternatives: programmatic agreement between democratic parties or delimitation of areas of agreement and dis-agreemnt."

The view of Asoka Mehta is that a backward economy gives impetus to undue pressures of caste and religion and results in social stagnation.

The cooperation of all patriotic persons is necessary for solving the complex economic problems confronting the country. He pointed out that there could be agreement between the Congress and the Paraja Socialist Party on the important issues of nationalism, secularism and democracy. Dr. Lohia opposed the move of Asoka Mehta for cooperation and described the socialism of Asoka Mehta as "paralysed socialism".

The view of Asoka Mehta is that socialism has been protean in thought and prolific in expression and socialism of India is bound to be shaped by the circumstances prevailing in India. He emphasises the relevance of Socialism, Communism and Anarchism in the Indian context in these words, "For India their relevance lies in the fact that Gandhi shared the Proudhon—Kropotkin traditions and Nehru had opted for the social democratic path and currently the Communist models cast their glamour on influential Indians."

The view of Asoka Mehta is that the views of Gandhiji and Lohia on socialism are Utopian. His view is that India is a very poor and backward country and hence cannot ignore industrialisation as suggested by Gandhiji and Vinoba Bhave. To quote him, "It was to offer a solution to the flood of industrial goods flowing into Germany that Frederick List developed the theory of protection of infant industries. The same theory was developed in India by the late Justice Ranade. The protection theory suggested that the state has a positive role to play in economic life. The blind forces of market cannot be permitted to operate because if they do, all wealth will accumulate in England and men would decay in the rest of the world. Ranade's voice remained a voice in wilderness. My point is that laws of the market were not respected by capitalists in under-developed countries. State must intervene at every stage and instead of leaving economic decisions to the blind forces of the market, these decisions should be taken by a Central Planning Authority."

Asoka Mehta criticized capitalism in India and explained the popularity of socialism in the Soviet Union in these words: "While capitalism is betraying symptoms of senility and decay, the socialist sector of the world has been growing from strength to strength. These twin phenomena have destroyed the confidence in capitalism and vindicated the prognostications of Marx."

Asoka Mehta puts more emphasis on development than on distribution. To quote him, "Unless development gathers speed early enough, population can retard further development. Only a rapid tempo of development can maintain an accelerating momentum, check fertility, raise levels of living and uphold democracy. Development rather than distribution is therefore the first principle of Indian socialism." Asoka Mehta advocates planning through the National Planning Commission for rapid development. It was to put this idea into practice that he agreed to become the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission of the Government of India. Asoka Mehta gives top priority to tools and techniques and iron, steel, coal and power industries. For capital formation, he suggests the method of austerity and also the use of surplus manpower in the country. To quote him, "Being an under-developed country, accumulation of capital in India will not be painless. We shall have to depend on our immense

human resources to further the formation of capital. Roads will have to be built, canals cut, tanks repaired by human labour. The labour must come through the willing consent of the people." Asoka Mehta does not stand for wholesale nationalisation. In his philosophy, there is a place both for the public sector and the private sector.

Asoka Mehta was a critic of the measures adopted by Prime Minister Nehru for village uplift. He criticised the Community Development Blocks as envisaged by Nehru as there was no reinforcing centre. He also criticized the Panchayati Raj institutions. They remained at the mercy of the top officers in the administration. Cooperative farming also did not make any headway. While Asoka Mehta criticised what had been done in India, he praised what had been done in China under Mao Tse-Tung in these words: "Here is an example of not only enriching agriculture but of complex technological product being fitted into de-centralised production schemate". Asoka Mehta does not stand for a self-sufficient autonomous village but he likes the village economy to be an integral part of the whole economy. He stands for small-scale industries alongwith mechanised large-scale and heavy industries. His view is that large-scale industries alone cannot meet the needs of society. Goods have to be produced by light industries and traditional handicrafts.

Asoka Mehta is in favour of the idea of trusteeship in the matter of property and he considers the same to be basic to socialism. He also approves of the process of production advocated by Gandhiji. He describes Gandhiji's subordination of "the use of dead tools to very sensitive human tools" as a Marxian analysis.

Asoka Mehta is not in favour of a totalitarian state. He also does not approve of the idealist theory of the state. Like Laski and Barker, he advocates the pluralist view of the state. He is a critic of the centralizing tendencies in the planned economy of the Soviet Union. He stands for democratic socialism and not state socialism which he considers to be another name for state capitalism.

Asoka Mehta does not accept the concept of dialectical materialism as expounded by Marx. He also criticies Marx on the ground that it has ended in "a flight from freedom into forgetfulness." To quote him, "The proletariat through a long process of stripping, through its infusion with dialectical philosophy ends very nearly as the terrible simplificature. The pilgrimage of freedom ends in a prison house of its principle." Again, "The Marxists have never been happy with democracy. To deny it and where necessary to disrupt it, becomes their instinctive approach."

Asoka Mehta is called by his critics a Fabianist or a revisionist. He stands both for democracy and socialism. To quote him, "Nationalism, democracy and socialism each can give wings to men for journeying to the sky and also in excesses and through extravaganza turn to the opposite prison. It is essentially a matter of proportions of balance of checks and counterpoise."

The view of Asoka Mehta is that some of the views of Gandhiji are Utopian and not realistic. He does not approve of Gandhiji's opposition to industrialisation. He does not approve of self-sufficient autonomous villages. However, he approves of Gandhiji's techniques for the achievement

of objectives. About Gandhiji he said that he was "a strange kind of revolutionary, a reformer who prided on his conservatism, who relished a dash for the future with a bias for the past".

However, he approved of the concept of Satyagraha as given by Gandhiji. To quote him, "Gandhiji wanted a revolution but without the ravages, ruins and recrimination that have generally disfigured it." Asoka Mehta also agrees with the view of Gandhiji that means are as important as the end itself. He is also of the view that Gandhiji's Satyagraha was not a mere tactic to secure the transfer of power from the hands of the British into those of the Indians. It was a revolution in its own right. Gandhiji stood for a permanent revolution, a limitless regeneration of human nature through truth and non-violence.

Like Gandhiji, Asoka Mehta also stands for decentralisation to the maximum. He also wants the Panchayats to be given sufficient powers so that they can play their part in the economy of the country.

Asoka Mehta is also an advocate of social reforms as social reforms have their effect on the economic development of the country. To quote him, "Construction work, restructuring of the village community alone can generate cooperation and the spirit that will help the traditional elements to get productivewised. Modernisation is necessary and that new spirit is needed to create a cultural milieu wherein it becomes impossible to absorb large investments and higher techniques".

Asoka Mehta stands for socialism but also at the same time for liberty and democracy. He wants the individual to have his liberty and that is why he is opposed to totalitarianism and regimentation. He is a critic of the methods employed by the Soviet Union. He condemned the Soviet Union for the brutalities committed by her in Hungary and Czechoslavakia. He condemned Communist China for her attack on India. He stands for the improvement of the lot of the downtrodden in the country. He wants a socialism in India which is suited to her conditions and traditions. He is criticized by the socialists on the ground that he accepted office in the Congress Government.

Asoka Mehta is a man of learning. He is a man of integrity. He is a pragmatic socialist in whose heart the needs of the country have the highest priority.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Armugam, M., : *Socialist Thought in India : The Contribution of Rammanohar Lohia*, New Delhi, 1978.

Bhattacharjea, Ajit : *Jayaprakash Narayan*, Delhi, 1978.

Gupta, Ramchandra : *J.P. : From Marxism to Total Revolution*, New Delhi, 1981.

Jayaprakash Narayan : *Towards Total Revolution*, Popular Prakashan, Bombay.

Jayaprakash Narayan : *Prison Diary* (1975), Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1977.

Jayaprakash Narayan : *Why Socialism* ? Banaras, 1934.

Jayaprakash Narayan : *Towards Struggle* (*Edited by Yusuf Meherally*), Bombay, 1946.

Jayaprakeah Narayan : *Communitarian Society and Panchayati Raj*, Varanasi, 1970.

Jayaprakash Narayan : *Nation-Building in India.*
Jayaprakash Narayan : *From Socialism to Sarvodaya*, 1959.
Jayaprakash Narayan : *A Picture of Sarvodaya Social Order*, Tanjore, 1956.
Jayaprakash Narayan : *Plea for Reconstruction of Indian Polity*, Kashi, 1959.
Jayaprakash Narayan : *Sarvodaya Social Order*, Tanjore, 1957.
Jayaprakash Narayan : *Swaraj for the People*, Varanasi, 1968.
Jayaprakash Narayan : *The Evolution Towards Sarvodaya*, 1957.
Kelkar, Indumati : *Lohia : Siddhanta Aur Karma*, Hyderabad, 1963.
Lal, Lakshmi Narain : *Jayaprakash—Rebel Extraordinary*, New Delhi, 1975.
Lal, Mukut Behari : *Life of Narendra Deva* (in Hindi).
Lohia, Ram Manohar : *Marx, Gandhi and Socialism*, Hyderabad, 1963.
Lohia, Ram Manohar : *Wheels of History.*
Lohia, Ram Manohar : *Aspects of Socialist Policy*, Bombay, 1952.
Lohia, Ram Manohar : *Will to Power and Other Writings*, Hyderabad, 1956.
Lohia, Ram Manohar : *Towards the Destruction of Castes and Classes*, Hyderabad, 1958.
Lohia, Ram Manohar : *The Caste System*, Hyderabad, 1964.
Lohia, Ram Manohar : *The Guilty Men of India's Partition*, Allahabad, 1960.
Mahajan, V.D. : *History of Modern India* (1919-1982), Vol. II, S. Chand & Co., (Pvt.) Ltd., New Delhi, 1983.
Masani, Minoo : *Is JP the Answer ?* MacMillan, Delhi, 1975.
Mehta, Asoka : *Studies in Asian Socialism*, Bombay, 1959.
Mehta, Asoka : *Democratic Socialism*, 1951.
Mehta, Asoka : *Socialism and Peasantry*, Bombay, 1953.
Mehta, Asoka : *Reflections on Socialism.*
Mehta, Asoka : *Reflections on Socialist Party*, 1977.
Mehrotra, N.C. : *Lohia, A Study*, 1978.
Narendra Deva : *Socialism and the National Revolution*, Bombay, 1946.
Narendra Deva : *Rashtriyata Aur Samajavada* (in Hindi), Banaras, 1949.
Nehru, Jawaharlal : *Autobiography.*
Raghunath : *Thoughts of JP* (in Hindi).
Sharad Omkar : *Jayaprahash Narayan*, Allahabad, 1977.
Sharad Omkar : *Lohia*, Allahabad, 1967.

CHAPTER XXVII

Acharya Vinoba Bhave (1895-1982)

Acharya Vinoba Bhave, the father of Sarvodaya and Bhoodan movements, was born on 11 September, 1895 and he died on 15 November, 1982 at the the age of 88. He was born in a high class Chitpavan Brahman family in the Gagoda village of Maharashtra. His mother was a pious and generous woman and his father was a textile expert who wanted his son to go to England for higher education. From the very beginning, the young Vinoba had an inclination towards an ascetic life. He took a vow of celibacy at the age of ten. He gave up his studies, burnt all his important school certificates and set off for Banaras. Reading a newspaper version of a public lecture by Gandhiji who had come back from South Africa, he was attracted by the moral and political programme of Gandhiji and hence joined his Ashram at Sabarmati near Ahmedabad in 1916.

Vinobaji distinguished himself by his sincerity and reliability. When he was 25, Gandhiji gave him the title of Acharya. In 1921, Gandhiji sent Vinobaji to Wardha in Central India, to open a new Ashram there. He continued to work with Gandhiji for years and was considered to be a great disciple of Gandhiji. When Gandhiji started the Civil Disobedience movement in 1940, he chose Vinobaji the first Satyagrahi to court arrest. He was arrested and he remained in jail for about five years. He was already a master of Sanskrit but in jail, he learnt Arabic and four Dravadian languages of South India. He studied the Quran to understand the Muslims. After the assassination of Gandhiji in January 1948, Vinobaji was generally looked to as Gandhiji's heir and successor in the realm of non-violent theory and practice. He began to live in his Ashram at Param Dham, Paunar in Madhya Pradesh.

The life of Vinobaji was influenced by Gandhiji, Saint Jnaneshwar and Shankar. To quote Vinobaji, "Shankar, Jnaneshwar and Gandhiji have been the dominant formative influences in my life. I am indebted to Shri Shankaracharya for the intellectual grounding and background of Vedanta he has given me. I cannot express my words how much I am beholden to the great saint Jnaneshwar. The epic poem he wrote is the brightest. It is the epic poem which has aroused warmth and feeling in my heart".

Ethical Ideas

Vinobaji had an unshakeable faith in the existence of God. His view was that senses may sometimes deceive us but the minor experience revealing the reality of God could not falter. He relied upon the Vedas and the Upanishads which reveal "whatever is—is Brahma, the Absolute".

Vinobaji believed in the equality of all religions. His view was that

there is a fundamental unity of mankind and of religions. The essence of religion is love, service and compassion. However, institutionalised religion has proved to be a source of conflict among different religions and Vinobaji was opposed to it. True religion was not incompatible with modern scientific knowledge Vinobaji did not consider idol worship as a superstition as God who is omnipresent, can be seen in the idols also. Idol worship was merely a stage towards the realisation of God. Vinobaji put great emphasis on right or moral conduct. According to him, theft of gold, drink, adultery and murder were secondary defects, but untruth is the basic moral evil. Truth is the fundamental moral virtue but now-a-days we have reserved its practice only for school children and authorities. Untruth is condoned in politics, trade, courts and marriages. Morality and faith in God are indissolubly interlinked.

Social Ideas

Vinobaji laid great emphasis on education which he considered to be essential for bringing about a social change. In his book named "Thoughts on Education", Vinobaji criticized the existing system of education as bookish and not related to the grim realities of life. It neither developed the character nor the personality of the student. He recommended Nai Talim or basic education as a substitute for the existing system of education. He criticized the Government control over education and recommended the decentralisation of education.

He had no trace of untouchability in his heart. He believed in communal unity with the same passion as Gandhiji did. He was a crusader against the slaughter of cows. He took up the issue in 1976 and threatened to go on fast and actually went on fast. He wanted his followers to fan out across the country and mobilise public opinion in favour of a total ban on cow slaughter.

He stood for certain moral values which we recognised as being capable of exercising a desirable influence on public life. He was considered as an embodiment of those non-denominational spiritual concepts that underlie the Indian ideal. He blended idealism with social awareness.

His campaign in Telengana during the Communist-inspired revolt, his Sampattidan, Gramdan and Bhoodan movements, tours of the dacoit-infested regions of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan revealed a profound concern in human beings. Unlike many other servants, he was not content with only preaching salvation. In the light of his own convictions, he also tried to improve living conditions. People flocked to him.

His Views on State

To begin with, Vinobaji was not against the state. This is clear from the fact that he relied upon the state to apply to society "the principle of the economics of the family or the parable of the lame and the blind."

However, with the passage of time, the attitude of Vinobaji towards the state changed and he began to consider it as an artificial institution which is not natural in the sense we consider the body, mind and society. It was an artificial product imposed on society. The state is the source of many evils. It crushes intellectual freedom. The books which are studied

by the students are prescribed by the Education Department of the state and the result is that the students stop thinking independently and impartially. Education is not a matter of choice for an individual but it is a choice of the Government. The state has also become an agency of command which demands obedience in the name of discipline. To quote him, "Under the banner of discipline, many are required to follow the bidding of one. We have forgotten the teachings of our Rishis and saints who instructed us only to follow the command of God. We have instead come to see God in Government." The state also corrupts all those who are in power. To quote him, "The seat of power is such. Whosoever sits on it, becomes narrow in outlook. He develops fears and desires to safeguard himself by keeping a large army". The state makes a few persons the arbiters of the fates of all. It is they who guide the policy of the state and not the people. Public opinion is not given any importance. The same happens in the case of monarchy or a republic. In actual practice, democracy is the rule of the majority which may be unscrupulous and may tyrannise over the minority. The people want peace but their desire is obstructed by those in control of Government who are war-minded.

Vinobaji was opposed to the multiplication of the functions of the state or a welfare state as he found a danger in them. To quote him, "The conception of a democratic Government which takes more and more responsibility in its hands to provide for more welfare of the people is fraught with immense danger. This tendency results in robbing the citizens of their manliness and makes them devoid of all initiative which is at the root of all progress. No compartment of life is left untouched by the state machinery and the scope of development of human virtues like love, compassion, sharing for the common good etc. becomes almost nil. That is why I deprecate the idea of a welfare state and advocate instead a state which will have welfare done by its citizens."

The view of Vinobaji was that democracy is not a Government by "all the people". It does not ensure even a majority rule. The reason is that all the voters do not take part in the general elections in any democracy. Very rarely, the party which is victorious at the polls and forms the Government, secures an absolute majority of the votes polled. Even that majority becomes less when factions in the party in power are taken into consideration. Ordinarily, the election of a Prime Minister is not the unanimous choice of the party. He may be elected by a majority of the members only. Even the decisions in the cabinet are not always unanimous. The result is that rule by a representative democracy is a big mockery. The position of the Prime Minister has become so strong that the members of his party have always to support him or her under all circumstances. The Prime Minister can become a tyrant. Obviously, such a rule cannot be called the rule by the poeple. Money has come to play a very important role in the politics of every country. Too much of expenditure on elections results in corruption. Persons of calibre do not get elected because they do not have lacs of superfluous money. Parties are bribed by the vested interests to get laws passed which favour them even at the cost of the nation. Casteism and communalism also play their part in elections. Candidates for election are not chosen by the people but by the leaders of the parties and choice before the people is a limited one. They have to vote only for those candidates who have been set up by the political parties.

Modern administrative system has become highly centralised and the result is that the individual has lost his identity and become merely a cog in the machine. He is neither self-reliant nor self-governing. The people were losing their independence, self-reliance, initiative and enterprising spirit. Vinobaji wanted the people to plan their own welfare from the village level upwards. The state should serve only as a source of inspiration and encouragement and not act as a guardian of the welfare of the people.

Vinobaji was also critical of the Five Year Plans of the Government of India. His view was that the planners did not attach due importance to the problems of food, work and adequate wages to the citizens within a specified period of time. The planners should have put more emphasis on the development of agriculture than on industries as India is primarily an agricultural country.

Vinobaji pointed out how the highly expensive administrative and other Departments of the Government were known as "Services". There is the Civil Service, Medical Service, Educational Service etc. The officials of the Civil Service are paid four figure salaries while their masters, the poor of the country whom they profess to serve, have to live on a mere pittance. It is a tragic paradox that those who earn lacs are called servants while those who produce food for the nation are regarded as self-seekers. According to Vinobaji, it is mere hyprocrisy to call the officers of the Government as servants. In order to put an end to this hypocrisy, Vinobaji put forward the idea of land being the common property of all. All that we have, our land and property and intelligence, everything has to be an offering to society. On the basis of non-possession will be built a grand and beautiful society.

Ideal Government

In Swaraj Shastra, Vinobaji explained the principles of a non-violent political order. He adopted two classical lines from Sanskrit viz., "I do not desire to govern" and "Let us try for self-Government." Vinobaji prefers a form of Government in which there is the rule of all to the forms of Government in which one or more than one rules. The rule of all is also not acceptable to Vinobaji unless it is accompanied by the principle of non-violence, the reason being that the rule of all is unreal unless it is combined with the principle of non-violence. The ideal form of Government will emerge when the people join together and of their free will and after due deliberation, invest with power one or more of themselves, whom they know to be free from attachment and hatred, devoted to the welfare of all, and wise and capable, then though that Government may in form be the rule by one or rule by more than one, still if it is based on non-violence, it should in reality be regarded as rule by all".

Vinobaji laid down certain principles which point out the direction in which the Government should move. Those principles are international brotherhood, cooperation of all the elements of a nation (cooperation being willing and active rather than mere acquiescence), unity of interests as between the capable few and the masss, regard for all-sided and equal development of every member of society, the most extensive distribution of governmental power, the least amount of governing, the simplest Gov-

ernment machinery, the lowest administrative expenditure, the smallest organisation for defence and spread of knowledge uninterrupted, unbiased and free. Vinobaji prescribed four conditions for a faultless form of Government. Those four conditions are that capable individuals will direct their capacity to the service of the people, that the people will be fully self-dependent and cooperate with each other, that non-violence will be the basis of their continual cooperation and occasional non-cooperation or resistance and honest work on the part of any one will be considered to be of equal value.

Planning

Vinobaji was opposed to the idea of planning by the Government, particularly by the Central Government. He preferred village planning to national planning. His view was that planning was possible only at the level of the village. Work has to be distributed and the village has to undertake the responsibility. Prosperity and welfare is possible only when it starts at the bottom. The idea of national planning is based on the presumption that once prosperity is achieved in the centre or at the top, it would percolate from there and reach the bottom, but that was not correct. To quote Vinobaji, "The Government is after all only a bucket while the people are like a well. If there is no water in the well, how can there be any in the bucket? We will, therefore, go to the source of water—the people." Again, "A zero in combination with unity fields ten. The zero has its great utility but without unity it is of no use. So unity represents the self-reliant power of the people, while zero represents the power of a Government circular. The state power can be effective only if it is based on the people's initiative or Loka Shakti".

The view of Vinobaji was that the power of the people (Lok Shakti) is the opposite of the power of violence. Though there is no such trenchant opposition between the power of the people and the power of the state, yet the two are different. It is true that there is an element of violence in the power of the state also, but as this power has been entrusted to the state by the people, its character differs from that of naked violence and the two cannot be put together in the same class. Vinobaji would like to go ahead and create conditions which will do away with the need to use even the power of the state. Then only it can be said that the Sarvodaya Samaj was established. If we go after political power in the mistaken belief that it is the only way to serve the people, we will not only fail to fulfil the expectations of the people but may also prove a burden to them.

Decentralisation

The view of Vinobaji was that the power of the state should be as little as possible and as far as possible there should be complete decentralisation of powers and functions. The state should have "an advisory council of capable, experienced and respected persons which could be referred to for guidance, whilst it would be the people who will plan their own welfare from the level of the village upwards and execute it. The state authority in that ideal situation will inspire and encourage people to act for their own welfare and not plan and carry out the welfare work

itself. The state of my conception which will have welfare done by its citizens, must be a decentralised state." All powers must be concentrated at the bottom. Powers should go on reducing themselves as they reach the top. The top should be like the top of the Egyptian pyramids sustained by the strength of the base which is the villages.

Self-sufficient Village

Vinobaji stood for self-sufficient villages. The villagers should have their own industries which they can control. They should be vested with all the authorities. They should decide what is to be produced in the village, what is to be imported and what is to be exported. There should be a Panchayat in every village. The Panchayat should consist of the wise and capable people of the village. The decisions of the Panchayat should be by unanimity and not by majority. If there is no unanimity, the members of the Panchayat should resign and another Panchayat should be created. The members of the Thana Panchayat are chosen not by all the inhabitants of the Thana but by the members of the village Panchayats of that Thana. Likewise, the District Panchayat is not to be elected by all the inhabitants of the District but nominated by the members of the Thana Panchayats of that District. The members of the Provincial Panchayat are to be nominated by the members of the District Panchayats and not by the people of the province. The members of the Central Panchayat are to be chosen by the members of the Provincial Panchayats and not by the people of the whole country.

Political Parties

Vinobaji was opposed to the party system. His view was that political parties divide the people in watertight compartments and detract them from selfless service. They prevent a member from rising above the narrow loyalty to the political party. They try to get power by hook or by crook. They throttle opposition. They concentrate more on organisation. discipline and propaganda than on the good of the people. To quote Vinobaji, "I do not recognise parties at all. Parties in our country can not only not do much but are in the long run likely to prove disastrous".

Critics point out that it is impossible to have a partyless democracy as advocated by Vinobaji. It is too much to expect that political parties in the world still commit suicide and cease to exist. Those who have a vested interest in their continuation will see to it that political parties continue. Moreover, the people in the villages or otherwise have neither the time nor the brains to manage their affairs independently. It is expecting too much from them. It is good to talk of unanimity in coming at conclusions but it is practically impossible to have the same in actual practice. In most cases, things have to be done according to the majority view. It is also maintained that political parties are neither artificial nor unnatural. People having a similarity of views join different political parties. Political parties also help in redressing the grievances of the people by presenting a united front. Moreover, the very working of democracy depends upon the party system. A political party acts as "the broker of ideas". It "lifts the masses from their narrow environment of localism and bestows upon them a broader national outlook." The Shanti Sena of Vinobaji may

not be a political party in the strict sense of the term as it is not to fight elections, but otherwise it has all the features of a political party. It has its ideology. It indulges in propaganda for Bhoodan and Gramdan. It has its own discipline and he who violates its discipline ceases to be a member of the Shanti Sena.

Elections

Vinobaji criticized the existing system of elections. He compared them to a race in which each party tries to pull down the leg of the other rather than surpass him in the field. If one party is doing social service, the other parties feel jealous and try to hinder the same so that the party doing social service may not take advantage of it at the time of elections. Moreover, elections involve waste of time and money. They detract the attention of the people from the higher tasks of reconstruction of the country. They mislead the people through their propaganda. Elections give an undue advantage to the rich over the poor as the former alone have money to fight elections. According to Vinobaji, the right of the people to vote is like the power of the sheep to elect the shepherd. It does not lead to any material change in the condition of the sheep.

Laws

The view of Vinobaji is that however good and effective laws may be, they are not enough. They do not make the society strong. What gives real strength and cohesion to society is trust. If there is no trust between the people and the Government, that community cannot become strong. Laws will of course be made and people will observe them as well as they may, but that may not add to the strength of the nation. If the people have no trust in the Government, they might fail the latter just at the time of test, with disastrous results for both. Law cannot create trust which alone is the source of strength. Law cannot create love and respect. Only Dharma or the consciousness of a moral imperative or a sense of social obligation alone can do it.

The view of Vinobaji was that he was indifferent about legislation. He did not want to agitate for any legislative measure. A legislation which follows a change in the moral principles of a people is just a formality of record. Vinobaji had no objection to legislation being brought in after the moral atmosphere was ready for it.

War

Vinobaji had his own views regarding war. According to him, "I am not afraid of World Wars. I am rather afraid of small wars and quarrels". His explanation is that a world war appears to come very close to non-violence in one of its consequences. When World Wars are fought, men are stimulated to think of the enormity of the damage caused by them and also think of ways and means of banishing war. A World War frees man's mind from limitations which make him think in narrow grooves and impels him to think in terms of humanity as a whole. This is not true of small wars. Those who believe in violence try to prevent world wars as far as possible but go on with small wars.

Non-Possession

The view of Vinobaji is that all that we have, our land and property and intelligence, everything has to be an offering to society. Non-possession will not impoverish the people but enrich them as members of community though not as individuals with separate interests. On the basis of non-possession will be built a grand and beautiful society.

Vinobaji pointed out that it is wrongly held that non-possession is only for Sanyasis or ascetics and the common people cannot do without possession. The existing system leads to greed. There is an imposing legal frame-work to protect those who have property. We consider stealing to be a crime but connive at those who encourage that anti-social activity by amassing heaps of money. It is the miser who gives rise to the thief. We condemn the thieves to rot in the prison houses but let their creators roam about in complete freedom. They even occupy seats of honour and respectability in society. This is not justice. Such people are called thieves in the Gita. At the time of putting oblations into sacrificial fire, they say, "This is for Indra, not for me". Likewise, we should say of whatever we produce in the fields or factories, "This is for the community, for the nation ; it is not for me." We should dedicate all that we have to society and what we receive from society according to our needs will be life-giving like nectar.

When people are prepared to offer their all to society we will build up a Government which will not ask for help from foreign countries or paper currency from the Nasik Press. Every Indian home will be its bank. People will readily comply with whatever demand it may choose to make on them. People will leave all their worries to the care of society and be themselves free from any worry or insecurity. As the people were not prepared to offer their all to society, Vinobaji demanded only one-sixth of their property to begin with.

True basis of Society

Vinobaji made observations on the true basis of human society. Mere individualistic life does not satisfy us. We live in society and only by serving it we get real inner satisfaction. We cannot live in isolation from society. That is why there is such a thing as society. There are various kinds of laws for the governance of society and people generally try to obey them. They may appear to be a sort of bondage but the people agree to regulate their conduct in accordance with those laws in deference to the social will. They may criticize them but generally do not violate them. That is how society goes on.

Sarvodaya Samaj

After the death of Gandhiji, his co-workers and followers met at Sevagram in March 1948 to discuss ways and means to implement his last will and testament in which Gandhiji had said, "India has still to attain moral and economic independence in terms of its seven hundred thousand villages as distinguished from its cities and towns. The struggle for the ascendancy of civil over military power is bound to take place in India's progress towards its democratic goal. The Congress must be kept out of

not be a political party in the strict sense of the term as it is not to fight elections, but otherwise it has all the features of a political party. It has its ideology. It indulges in propaganda for Bhoodan and Gramdan. It has its own discipline and he who violates its discipline ceases to be a member of the Shanti Sena.

Elections

Vinobaji criticized the existing system of elections. He compared them to a race in which each party tries to pull down the leg of the other rather than surpass him in the field. If one party is doing social service, the other parties feel jealous and try to hinder the same so that the party doing social service may not take advantage of it at the time of elections. Moreover, elections involve waste of time and money. They detract the attention of the people from the higher tasks of reconstruction of the country. They mislead the people through their propaganda. Elections give an undue advantage to the rich over the poor as the former alone have money to fight elections. According to Vinobaji, the right of the people to vote is like the power of the sheep to elect the shepherd. It does not lead to any material change in the condition of the sheep.

Laws

The view of Vinobaji is that however good and effective laws may be, they are not enough. They do not make the society strong. What gives real strength and cohesion to society is trust. If there is no trust between the people and the Government, that community cannot become strong. Laws will of course be made and people will observe them as well as they may, but that may not add to the strength of the nation. If the people have no trust in the Government, they might fail the latter just at the time of test, with disastrous results for both. Law cannot create trust which alone is the source of strength. Law cannot create love and respect. Only Dharma or the consciousness of a moral imperative or a sense of social obligation alone can do it.

The view of Vinobaji was that he was indifferent about legislation. He did not want to agitate for any legislative measure. A legislation which follows a change in the moral principles of a people is just a formality of record. Vinobaji had no objection to legislation being brought in after the moral atmosphere was ready for it.

War

Vinobaji had his own views regarding war. According to him, "I am not afraid of World Wars. I am rather afraid of small wars and quarrels". His explanation is that a world war appears to come very close to non-violence in one of its consequences. When World Wars are fought, men are stimulated to think of the enormity of the damage caused by them and also think of ways and means of banishing war. A World War frees man's mind from limitations which make him think in narrow grooves and impels him to think in terms of humanity as a whole. This is not true of small wars. Those who believe in violence try to prevent world wars as far as possible but go on with small wars.

Non-Possession

The view of Vinobaji is that all that we have, our land and property and intelligence, everything has to be an offering to society. Non-possession will not impoverish the people but enrich them as members of community though not as individuals with separate interests. On the basis of non-possession will be built a grand and beautiful society.

Vinobaji pointed out that it is wrongly held that non-possession is only for Sanyasis or ascetics and the common people cannot do without possession. The existing system leads to greed. There is an imposing legal frame-work to protect those who have property. We consider stealing to be a crime but connive at those who encourage that anti-social activity by amassing heaps of money. It is the miser who gives rise to the thief. We condemn the thieves to rot in the prison houses but let their creators roam about in complete freedom. They even occupy seats of honour and respectability in society. This is not justice. Such people are called thieves in the Gita. At the time of putting oblations into sacrificial fire, they say, "This is for Indra, not for me". Likewise, we should say of whatever we produce in the fields or factories, "This is for the community, for the nation ; it is not for me." We should dedicate all that we have to society and what we receive from society according to our needs will be life-giving like nectar.

When people are prepared to offer their all to society we will build up a Government which will not ask for help from foreign countries or paper currency from the Nasik Press. Every Indian home will be its bank. People will readily comply with whatever demand it may choose to make on them. People will leave all their worries to the care of society and be themselves free from any worry or insecurity. As the people were not prepared to offer their all to society, Vinobaji demanded only one-sixth of their property to begin with.

True basis of Society

Vinobaji made observations on the true basis of human society. Mere individualistic life does not satisfy us. We live in society and only by serving it we get real inner satisfaction. We cannot live in isolation from society. That is why there is such a thing as society. There are various kinds of laws for the governance of society and people generally try to obey them. They may appear to be a sort of bondage but the people agree to regulate their conduct in accordance with those laws in deference to the social will. They may criticize them but generally do not violate them. That is how society goes on.

Sarvodaya Samaj

After the death of Gandhiji, his co-workers and followers met at Sevagram in March 1948 to discuss ways and means to implement his last will and testament in which Gandhiji had said, "India has still to attain moral and economic independence in terms of its seven hundred thousand villages as distinguished from its cities and towns. The struggle for the ascendancy of civil over military power is bound to take place in India's progress towards its democratic goal. The Congress must be kept out of

unhealthy competition with political parties and communal bodies." In order to carry out the will of Gandhiji, the Sarvodaya Samaj was set up. It was a sort of a brotherhood of those who believed in the theory and practice of truth and non-violence. The Samaj held its annual conferences at different places in the country. The first annual conference of the Sarvodaya Samaj was held in March 1949. The Sarva Seva Sangh was established and the various constructive programme organisations of Gandhiji were expected to merge into it and act as a single whole. The object of the Sarva Seva Sangh was to establish a non-violent society. The Sangh was not to participate in power-oriented political activities. It was not to have any affinity or partiality for any one of the political parties in the state. Democracy today means the rule of a party and the Sarva Seva Sangh desired to make it the rule of the people and was not interested in the victory or defeat of any particular party. Its object was to bring about a change in the hearts of all and if it supported or opposed any one, the process of bringing about a change of heart was liable to be obstructed. That is why the Sangh had nothing to do with the political elections and was not to help any one in those elections.

While explaining the Sarvodaya Samaj, Vinobaji stated that it was not just an organisation. It was a mighty word expressive of a revolutionary idea. The Sarvodaya Samaj did not want the rise of the few not even of the many, or the rise of the greatest number. The members of the Samaj were not satisfied with the greatest good of the greatest number. They could be satisfied only with the good of one and all, of the high and the low, of the strong and the weak, the intellignet as well as the dull. The word "Sarvodaya" expresses this lofty and all-embracing sentiment. The idea of Sarvodaya is to merge oneself in the good of all. It demands on our part absolute faith in truth and non-violence. We should never resort to untruth in our private and public life, nor in our business or other occupation. We should try our best not to allow violence a place in our life. The constructive programme for the uplift of society should be carried out in part or in full, individually or with the cooperation of friends and colleagues and also by establishing local institutions wherever necessary. All the problems of the world would be solved if the attention of the young and the old could be concentrated on the ideal of Sarvodaya.

Bhoodan Movement

At the third annual Conference of the Sarvodaya Samaj held near Hyderabad in April 1951, Vinobaji placed a 4-Point programme before the Sarvodaya Samaj and that contained peace army, yarn contribution, the abolition of the sweeping profession and honest life movement. He also suggested that the agricultural labourers should be given their wages in the form of grain, that land revenue be realised in kind and the Government must take up the Khadi work itself. After the Conference was over, Vinobaji decided to tour Telengana as a member of the Shanti Sena. At that time, there was a lot of unrest and lawlessness in Telengana as a result of the activities of the Communists. Vinobaji felt that the main bone of contention was the possession of land. When Vinobaji was at Pochampalli, a small town in the Nalgonda District of Telengana, he was requested by the Harijans to get them land for cultivation and they

put their demand for 80 acres of land. Shri V. R. Reddy of the same town offered to donate as many as 100 acres of his land to Vinobaji for distribution among the landless Harijans. This was a great event in the life of Vinobaji. He felt that nature was helping him. While nature "gives appetite to the child, it not only provides the mother with the necessary milk but also inspires her to feed the child". Vinobaji began to ask for more and more land for free distribution among the people.

On 2 October 1951, Vinobaji announced his Five Year Plan in which he demanded five crores of acres of land. He put his appeal in these words, "If there are five sons in the family, I want to be considered the sixth, if four, the fifth. Thus I claim one-fifth or one-sixth of the total cultivable land in the country." Vinobaji declared that while asking for land, he was not begging for alms or charity. He was merely asking for the performance of a right and that right was to throw off the feeling of ownership.

Sampattidan and Gramdan

In October 1952, Vinobaji expanded his Bhoodan movement to include Sampattidan and Gramdan. Gramdan led to Gram Raj. To quote Vinobaji, "Our work should proceed on the basis of Vicharsasan or peaceful conversion of people to our view by making them think about it and Kartavaya Vibhajan or distribution of work among individuals without creating an administrative bureaucracy. We should strive to create a state which would not need to exercise its coercive authority. Then only will we be said to have a non-violent state. So with this end in view we make the demand for investing the village with the power to manage their own affairs so as to establish Gram Raj." Gram Raj was to be achieved through the generation of Jana Shakti and the foundation of a Samya-Yogi Samaj. To quote Vinobaji, "We should create Swatantra Jana Shakti (the self-reliant power of the people). It should be distinguished from the other two forms of power—the power of violence and the power of the state. The power of the people is the opposite of the power of violence, and though there is no direct opposition between the power of the people and the power of the state, yet the two are qualitatively different." Again, "Through Bhoodan I want to bring about equality in the political, economic and social spheres. I want that every village must have its own arrangement of education, industries, crafts, land distribution, defence and marketing and every village should have a Mandal to decide about things to be sold or purchased from without".

While the idea of Bhoodan came into the mind of Vinobaji in 1951 in Telengana, the idea of Gramdan came to him in Bihar. The idea of Shanti Sena came to Vinobaji while he was in Kerala. The view of Vinobaji was that programme of Shanti Sena was complimentary to the programme of Gram Swaraj as there could be no Gram Swaraj without the preservation and promotion of peace and non-violence. The Shanti Sena was to provide a non-violent substitute to the police force. Even Shanti Sena could operate successfully only if it was backed by the people themselves.

Vasant Nargolkar defines Gramdan as "voluntary abolition of private property and land and investing it in the community as a whole as represented by the village". In Gramdan, there is to be no individual owner-

ship of land. Each family has to cultivate the land with the help of other families. The produce from the land is to be shared by the community as a whole. A portion of the produce is to be set apart for annual use. Every individual is to be given a share from what is produced. A few shops in the village will be run and managed by the community as a whole.

To begin with, Vinobaji was not in favour of collecting money as it usually leads to friction and disputes. However, he later on felt the necessity of money for running the organisation for the fulfilment of his mission. He asked the landlords to give a part of their income for rehabilitating the landless labourers on land and also for maintaining the selfless Bhoodan workers.

In addition to Bhoodan, Gramdan and Sampattidan, Vinobaji advocated *Buddhidan* and Shramdan. As regards *Buddhidan*, Vinobaji asked the people belonging to the liberal professions to deliver lectures and contribute articles or conduct study circles. He wanted the intellectuals to donate a part of their intellect for the good of sociey. As regards Shramdan, he asked the people to offer free labour for projects of public utility and thereby save a lot of money of society which was being given as wages. The rendering of free service will give charm and happiness to the people.

Vinobaji on Gandhism

Vinobaji was a true disciple of Gandhiji and he believed in his philosophy. He learnt from him the ideas of equality of mankind, universal brotherhod, non-violence, dignity of labour, superiority of spiritual force over physical force, decentralisation, village autonomy, etc.

Vinobaji praised the technique of Satyagraha as propounded by Gandhiji. However, he pointed out that Satyagraha was useful before India got independence but now it is not desirable. To quote him, "Under those circumstances, the nature of work was negative and yet Gandhiji associated with it many items of positive constructive work. Now when we hold that the right of Satyagraha is fundamental even when a popular Government has been established, we have to understand that its nature would also become somewhat different. Only that kind of Satyagraha which is positively constructive will be more effective in a democracy. It is from this standpoint that we have to look at our Bhoodan movement."

The view of Vinobaji was that Satyagraha of Gandhiji's thinking was not effective in international affairs. To quote him, "Of what use could Satyagraha be in the field of international affairs. Satyagraha represents a spiritual power. It is not physical, neither it is mental. We have to ascend to the level of supermind if we are to get to know this power of Satyagraha. If we intend to solve the international problems by way of Satyagraha and not through popular opinion or governmental agencies, then we would have to raise ourselves to the supermental levels".

Anarchist Society

Vinobaji is called a philosophical anarchist. He was not only opposed to private property but also to state Government. He stood for partyless, stateless and classless society. To quote him, "I can understand someone saying that they cannot do without farming or without industry or crafts,

without love or without religion. I can also understand the people saying that they cannot do without marriage. But I cannot see how the Government can be included among such things as we cannot do without". His view was that the rulers may be sent on vacation for two years to see what happens to society in their absence.

The view of Vinobaji was that society will not become disorderly in the absence of state. People will remain orderly because they are the embodiment of love and kindness. When people come to regard the whole society as a family writ large, there will be no conflicts. To quote him, "After all, man is governed by love. He is born through love and he grows through love and thirsts for love." A kingdom of kindness can be established in the world.

Vinobaji refers to three distinct stages for reaching the goal of stateless and classless society. Those are a free Central Government, a decentralised Self-Government state and pure anarchy or freedom from Government or Rajya Mukti. When there is Gram Swarajya, there will be no necessity for political parties or Government machinery. There will be no elections as at present. The persons who are considered to be the best Sevaks or servants will be chosen by the people by universal consensus. There will be no decisions by majority. The principle of Panch Bole Parmeshwar (Five Panchas speak the voice of God) will be strictly followed. The principle of unanimity is also to be followed in the selection of Thana or Taluka Panchayats, District Panchayats, Provincial Panchayats and Central Panchayats. The Central Government will interfere only on rare occasions and will act merely as an advisory body. It may ultimately become a non-entity. It may occasionally exercise moral power. To quote Vinobaji, "All the material power will reside in the village while the moral power will be exercised by the people at the Centre." This ultimate goal is described by Vinobaji as "Shasan Nirpeksha". The normal daily life of society will be based on Janashakti. The goal of Shasan Mukta Samaj will be achieved. To quote Vinobaji, "As the people's strength, capacity and knowledge will increase, as the element of mutual aid will develop, in like proportion will the need for the Government diminish. Then the Government will cease to be order-giving and will have to reconcile to advice-giving. In this way, as the community's morals develop, the need for administration will become less, until finally, I hope, administration itself will disappear".

In the Shasan Mukta Samaj, everything will be held in common. There will be complete identification of one with all. Every village was to be self-sufficient and not depend upon help from outside. Currency was to be replaced by labour currency. There was to be no necessity for maintaining an army. The keeping of an army is an act of cowardice and hence Vinobaji asked the Government of India to cut down its expenditure on the army. The view of Vinobaji was that if India cut down her expenditure on army, Pakistan would do likewise. The Shanti Sena (an army of non-violent followers) was to be maintained and used whenever necessary.

The view of Vinobaji was that both the state and the Government will wither away and a new order would be established in which there was universal peace. There would be no police squads, law courts and prisons.

The people will abide by the moral rules made by themselves. Thus, a genuine Lokniti based on Janshakti will be established.

Sarvodaya

The views of Vinobaji on Sarvodaya are similar to those of Gandhiji. To quote Vinobaji, "By the term Sarvodaya is meant arising of all but not the arising of some and decline of other. The concept of welfare of all creatures is contained in the term". Sarvodaya is a "supreme revolutionary concept. We do not aspire the emancipation of the greater or the greatest number of the people. The only solution lies in the emancipation of all, big and small, weak and the energetic, foolish and the intelligent all are to be emancipated". To achieve the ideal of Sarvodaya, Vinobaji advocated Bhoodan, Gramdan, Sampattidan, Buddhidan and Shramdan. He also advocated the abolition of the party system and the establishment of Gram Swaraj. He would like the people to live in a society in which there were no tensions, no rivalries or struggle for power. Each was to help the others for the betterment of all.

Vinobaji on Marxism

In 1957, Vinobaji compared the aims and methods of Sarvodaya with those of Communism and found them in substantial agreement. He expressed the view that Communism itself was not attached to destructive work and Communist ideology was worthy of consideration. It contained one great idea which was not to be found in other ideologies. Vinobaji called Marx as the Maha Muni or the great saint. By reading Marx, there has been a great change in the minds of innumerable people. The difficulty was with regard to the means to realise Communism.

Vinobaji points out that some people believe that there was a Satyayuga or age of truth in which there was no need for the state. There are others who believe that there was never a Satyayuga but it is yet to come and bound to come. Those who say that Satyayuga is a matter of the past can be called traditionalists and those who believe that Satyayuga is yet to come are Communists. The traditionalists and the Communists are believers in Satyayuga. One group describes what had passed away and the other what has yet to come. The view of Vinobaji is that neither the past nor the future is in his hands and what is in his hands is the present and therefore he wants to make the Satyayuga a reality of the present.

The view of the Communists is that the believers in non-violence were wandering in a Utopia. To quote them, "For the present we have to be prepared to make use of violence. But ultimately non-violence will come to prevail, i.e., for achieving non-violence in the end, we have to use a little violence today and we must be prepared for it. Therefore you have to suspend your non-violence for a while." However, Vinobaji does not accept this view.

Vinobaji asked the Communists to tell him how they were going to reach their paradise and their answer was that Vinobaji should now be prepared for some violence and killing. Vinobaji did not accept the view that non-violence could come after violence.

Vinobaji does not accept the Communist view that ultimately the state will "wither away". He points out that the Communists started revolution with the slogan, "The labourers' state (Mazdoor Ka Rajya)". After the completion of revolution, the Communist leaders changed the slogan to "a state for labourers" (Mazdooron Ke Liye Rajya). After firmly getting entrenched, they changed the slogan to "the rule over labourers" (Mazdooron par Rajya). Vinobaji stands for the withering away of the state right from now and not in the future which may never come. He criticized Communism in these words: "Within the short space of twenty years, the Russian Revolution has become so colourless that it has almost lost its original attraction. The reason for the same is that of the four aspects of capitalism, namely, centralisation, worship of the large-scale machinery, faith in violence and exploitation, scientific socialism seeks to retain the first three and avoid the last but this is impossible. It is a delusive labyrinth. It should not be difficult to see that in spite of all efforts to do away with force, it will be necesary to accompany the other three."

The view of Marx was that the power of the state will be captured by the people and ultimately the state will wither away and the governance of the country will go on without any interference of any central power. Vinobaji maintained that if the Communists respect this maxim of Marx, they have to believe in the goodness in men and trust the people. If goodness in man is not relied upon, the state will never wither away at any time and its authority will continue for ever. The Communists now say that the state should be made very strong and all power should be concentrated at the Centre. This is called the dictatorship of the proletariat. In spite of that, the Communists maintain that the state will wither away in the end in spite of the dictatorship of the proletariat at present. Vinobaji does not agree with this view. He points out that ideologists of Sarvodaya also believe in the total disappearance of the state authority in the end. In order to achieve that end, they believe that the weakening of the central power should begin from now. Without that, the state will never disappear at any time.

The view of Vinobaji was that Marxism is not an "ism" that can be translated into practice ignoring the nature of surrounding conditions and environments. It is a method of application. It has to udergo changes according to the altered conditions and circumstances of each place. In Russia, the revolution was not carried out exactly on the lines enunciated by Marx. The same is the case with the Communist Revolution in China. Marxism has to change its methods according to the conditions and circumstances of each place and in response to the demand of the times.

Sarvodaya is an ideal of life. It is ever ready and anxious to receive and absorb everything that is good in other ideologies and "isms". Sarvodaya is a free ideology embracing and comprehending the entire life. It is not simply born to combat or compete with any particular ideology. It moves onward from day to day. It welcomes and assimilates all that is good. Hence, Marxism can also find a place in its fold. Hence, there is no permanent conflict between the two ideologies of Marxism and Sarvodaya.

The view of Vinobaji was that Marxism will be of use to India only if it adapts itself to the conditions of this country. It can thrive only if

it works keeping the welfare of the people in view. If Marxism is an ideal that refuses to change, it will be of no human value. As the Ganges becomes wider and wider and moves on and finally merges in the Ocean, Marxism will merge into Sarvodaya one day.

The philosophic basis of Sarvodaya is consistent with and congenial to the cultural traditions and conditions of the people in India. Very few adjustments are required. As regards Marxism, it demands very great adjustments and that is why Vinobaji expressed the view that Marxism will be absorbed in Sarvdoaya.

Vasant Nargolkar points out that Vinobaji "shows scant respect for one of the doctrines of historical materialism, of inevitability of the social revolution as expounded by Marx, Engels and Lenin. He therefore condemns rigid schooling, regimentation of thought or indoctrination of both the young and the old." While Marx and his followers believed in violence and adhered to deceit, fraud, forgery and other immoral means for the achievement of their ends, Vinobaji puts great emphasis on morality and truth. The Communists believe that end justifies the means but Vinobaji believes that the means must be as pure as the end itself.

Vinobaji was a great scholar, a linguist and a saint. He wrote 34 books of which his Gita in Marathi has gone into 46 editions. It has been translated into 17 Indian and 5 foreign languages. He wrote books on Islam, Christianity, Sikhism and Buddhism. Some of his books are "Essence of the Christian Teachings", "Essence of the Koran", "Japuji", "Dhammapad" and "Essence of the Rigveda".

Vinobaji was a believer in secularism and communal harmony. He was a true Gandhite. He stood for the betterment of the lot of the Harijans. He moralised politics. He upheld the ideal of welfare of all.

However, his critics point out that Vinobaji went to extremes in his criticism of political parties, planning, elections, welfare state, the majority rule etc. He also put too much emphasis on decentralisation. He spent a lot of time in the Bhoodan movement. Critics point out that much of the land given away in Bhoodan was unculturable waste or disputed land and therefore practically useless. Land once donated by the landlord may be reclaimed by him on one pretext or the other. That actually happened in certain districts of Gujarat. The Bhoodan movement also led to fragmentation of land as small pieces of land were given in donation. There was no proper system of distribution of land donated to Vinobaji. A lot of land remained undistributed and the donors of land did not take any interest in the land donated by them and also did not cultivate them. The result was low production. The Bhoodan movement failed to arouse the conscience of the big landlords and propertied classes. It is only the middle class people who were attracted by the Bhoodan movement. The result was that the very purpose of bringing about a revolution in the minds of the rich failed and the citadels of feudalism and aristocracy were not shaken.

Critics also point out that Vinobaji himself admitted in these words his failure when the followers of the Bhoodan movement in Bihar and Orissa resorted to violence over the question of language: "I declare I have not achieved success and I accept defeat. People might say that I got

lacs of acres in Bhoodan and hundreds of villages in Gramdan. I am in terrible agony. I felt Bhoodan will be a means to establish peace, but now I find disorder in Bihar where we got maximum lands in Bhoodan and shootings in Orissa where we got hundreds of Gramdans". It is pointed out in defence of Bhoodan that valuable acres of land were also donated by the people to Vinobaji. Even otherwise, marginal land once thought unfit for cultivation has now been brought under the plough and with some development it is possible to bring most of the Bhoodan land into production. This is now being done by the Sarva Seva Farms. Unfortunately, Vinobaji left the follow-up action in Bhoodan to the Central Government and State Governments which did not take keen interest in the matter. Moreover, the vested interests began to assert themselves. Vinobaji was not able to develop the cadres that could have organised the task of legal aid to effect the necessary mutations, spearhead land development and mobilise the potential beneficiaries. He assumed that those would somehow follow but they did not. However, it cannot be denied that more land was donated and distributed under the Bhoodan movement than under the Official Land Ceiling legislation. Moreover, Bhoodan movement and the Gramdan experiment that followed created a moral climate that rendered it possible to reconstruct agrarian relations more widely. Unfortunately, the opportunity was missed.

The significance of the Bhoodan movement lies not in the acres of land that were secured for distribution, but in the atmosphere created by it. To quote Radhakrishnan, "The Bhoodan movement acquires great significance in this context of urgent change. It underlines traditions that are implicit in the Indian way of life. It recaptures the idea of the social order as the family writ large. The movement started by Acharya Vinoba Bhave is potentially revolutionary in character. Even if it does not by itself bring about an agrarian revolution, it prepares for it by producing a climate of opinion in which courageous methods of land reform can be put through".

Critics also criticise the suggestion of Vinobaji for the abolition of the Governments. It is contended that the Government is not an artificial imposition but a necessary evil. It is a "legal system subservient to a moral order". It is impossible to think of society without a Government.

Vinobaji also advocated the abolition of the state but critics point out to the view of Aristotle that the state comes into existence for the sake of mere life but continues to exist for the sake of good life. It is impossible to think of a society without a state.

Vinobaji has criticised the system of elections, but critics point out that there is no other way to run an indirect democracy. There have to be elections because very often people fail to arrive at a unanimous decision. Burns writes, "No one denies that existing representative assemblies are defective but even if an automobile does not work well it is foolish to go back into a farm cart, however romantic".

The criticism of legislation by Vinobaji is not justified. It is contended that legislation can be instrumental in converting the hearts of the people. A law may be lacking popular backing but it may serve an educational purpose. Many a time social legislation has been carried out even without

popular backing. Moreover, "Physical penalty may do positive good by provoking the required consciousness and rousing the good sense within one".

Vinobaji had advocated "Shasana Mukta Samaj" in which there is no Government machinery and everything is done by autonomous villages. This view is considered to be Utopian. It ignores the prevailing conditions in the villages where there are caste and class rivalries. Not much is being accomplished in the villages. It is impossible to expect that the villages will take unanimous decisions on all matters.

The economic structure advocated by Vinobaji is also Utopian and cannot be put into actual practice. Even the Communist Governments in the Soviet Union and China have not adopted the formula that each is to work according to his capacity and get according to his needs. Under such a system, there will be no incentive to hard work and people may multiply their needs in order to demand more from the village community. It may be impossible for the villagers to work for general welfare in a spirit of detachment. Even saints may find it impossible to do so.

The condemnation of heavy industries and big machines by Vinobaji is not just and proper. No progressive nation can exist without heavy industries and big machines. This is the experience of the Soviet Union also.

Critics also point out that the idea of money free economy is not realistic. It is impossible to substitute labour currency for the present currency. To quote Dr. Adi, "In a strictly economic sense, it is futile to dream of doing away with money for money is what money does. So long as the functions of money, primarily that of functioning as a medium of exchange, cannot be dispensed with, money cannot be simply wished out of existence".

Vinobaji has recommended the abolition of taxes and the reliance of society on donations. However, it is pointed out that the administration of a country cannot be carried on with the money got from donations.

Vinobaji has put too much emphasis on non-violence but he has ignored the fact that no amount of non-violence can stop the march of the invading armies. No realist will run the risk of exposing his country to the danger of foreign invasions. The past history of India is a warning in this direction.

Critics also point out that in the absence of the Government it may become difficult or rather impossible to protect the freedom of individuals. The authority of the Government alone is a guarantee for the freedom of individuals because otherwise the strong will be able to subjugate the weak. Bertrand Russell writes, "If as anarchists desire there were no use of force by Government, the majority could still bind themselves together and use force against the minority. The only difference would be that their army or police force would be ad hoc, instead of being permanent or professional".

SUGGESTED READINGS

Adi, H. : *Anarchist Thought in India.*
Bhagvan Das Kela : *Raj Vyavastha : Sarvodaya-Drishti* (in Hindi).
Dharmadhikari, Dada : *Sarvodaya-Darshan* (in Hindi), Kashi, 1957.

Gupta, S.C. : *Great Political Thinkers.*
Jayaprakash Narayan : *The Evolution Towards Sarvodaya*, Tanjore, 1957.
Jayaprakash Narayan : *A Picture of Sarvodaya Social Order*, Tanjore, 1955.
Jayaprakash Narayan : *Kranti ka Adhunik Prayog*, Patna. 1954.
Jayaprakash Narayan : *From Socialism to Sarvodaya.*
Pradhan, Benudhar : *The Socialist Thought of Mahatma Gandhi*, Delhi, 1980.
Ram, Suresh : *Vinoba and His Mission*, Varanasi, 1958.
Shah, Kanti Lal : *Vinoba on Gandhi*, Varanasi, 1973.
Varma, V.P. : *Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi and Sarvodaya*, 1965.
Vasant Nargolkar : *The Creed of Saint Vinoba.*
Vinoba Bhave : *Swaraj Shastra*, Varanasi, 1959.
Vinoba Bhave : *Bhoodan-Ganga*, Kashi, 1957.
Vinoba Bhave : *Bhoodan Yajna*, Ahmedabad, 1957.
Vinoba Bhave : *Bhoodan to Gramdan*, Tanjore, 1956.
Vinoba Bhave : *Swaraj-Shastra* (in Hindi), 1953.
Vinoba Bhave : *Sarvodaya Ke Adhar*, Kashi, 1956.
Vinoba Bhave : *Shanti Sena*, Kashi, 1961.
Vinoba Bhave : *Thoughts on Education*, Kashi, 1959.
Vinoba Bhave : *Talks on the Gita*, Kashi, 1959.
Vinoba Bhave : *Essence of the Quran*, 1963.

CHAPTER XXVIII

Sarvodaya

The term Sarvodaya is made up of two words, 'Sarva' and 'Udaya' and their literal meaning is "Uplift of all". However, it has been variously translated as "Good of all", "Service to all", "Welfare of all", "Gandhian Socialism" and "Co-operative Commonwealth. Mahatma Gandhi coined this term in 1904 in his attempt to paraphrase Ruskin's "Unto This Last". It embraces within its fold all the three teachings of "Unto This Last" as Gandhiji understood them. Those are: (1) the good of the individual is contained in the good of all, (2) a lawyer's work has the same value as that of the barber inasmuch as both have the right of earning their livelihood from their work, and (3) a life of labour, i.e., the life of the tiller of the soil and the handicraftsman, is the life worth living.

Sarvodaya is the Gandhian panacea for modern socio-economic ills from which the world is suffering at present. Its central problem is to reconcile the demands of egoism and altruism. It is based on Advaita Vedanta philosophy. It demands a transformation of the ego-centric outlook into altruistic outlook. The change is to be brought from within and not from without and the same can be done by means of persuasion.

Sarvodaya aims at creating a high moral atmosphere in the country. That is to be achieved by following the Gandhian principles of truth, non-violence and purity of means. The power of the people called Lok Shakti is to be developed.

Self-sacrifice is the essence of Sarvodaya. Every individual is to be ready and willing to sacrifice his own happiness for the sake of others. Every one is to follow the policy of giving and not taking. He should feel happy when he is giving and not when he is taking. He should work for others and not expect anything in return for the same.

Gandhiji did not like the manner in which India won her Independence. As a matter of fact, he refused to give a message for the people on the historic day of the transfer of power on 15 August 1947. It is said that when an Officer of the Information and Broadcasting Department, Government of India, who had come for a message told Gandhiji that if he did not give any message, it would not be good. The reply of Gandhiji was: "There is no message at all. If it is bad, let it be so".

The developments in the Congress after Independence made Gandhiji unhappy and he gave serious thought to the future of the Congress. In the draft constitution of the reorganised Congress which was prepared by Gandhiji in the last days of his life, he stated, "The Congress, in its present shape and form, as a propaganda vehicle and parliamentary machine,

has outlived its use. India has still to attain social, moral and economic independence in terms of India's seven hundred thousand villages as distinguished from cities and towns. The struggle for the ascendancy of civil over military power is bound to take place in India's progress towards its democratic goal. The Congress must be kept out of unhealthy competition with the political parties and communal bodies. For these and other similar reasons, the All-India Congress Committee resolves to disband the existing Congress organisation and flower into a Lok Sevak Sangh under the following rules with the power to alter these as occasion may demand".

The political followers of Gandhiji were not in a mood to liquidate the existing Congress and hence it was decided that the constructive workers should meet at Wardha towards the end of February 1948 and prepare a programme embodying the Gandhian principles of national reconstruction to be placed before the country and the Government. Gandhiji himself was to guide the meeting. On account of his death on 30 January 1948, the meeting was actually held at Wardha in December 1949 under the Presidentship of Kaka Kalelkar and adopted a plan "to attain social, moral and economic independence" as envisaged by Gandhiji. The Plan was published on 20 January 1950 as Sarvodaya Plan. Vinobaji became its chief exponent. Later on, Jayaprakash Narayan joined Vinobaji and since then the Sarvodaya workers have been spreading the gospel of Sarvodaya.

The ideal which the Sarvodaya Plan set out to achieve is a non-violent, non-exploitative cooperative society which is not based on caste or class and where there is an equal opportunity for all. The present competitive economy has to be replaced by a social economy based on cooperation. Proprietorship in agricultural land is to vest in the tiller of the soil under regulations laid down by society. There is to be re-distribution of land and no one is to have more land than three times the economic holding. The uneconomic holdings have to be pooled into cooperative farms. There has to be collective farming on waste lands brought under cultivation. Farmers carrying on cultivation on individual farms have to function through the village multi-purpose society. At the price levels existing at that time, Rs. 100/- per month was to be the lowest wage or income and twenty times that amount per month was to be the highest wage or income.

The plan divided industry into centralised and decentralised industries. Centralised industries were to be owned by society and run by autonomous corporations or cooperatives if possible. Centralised industries were to be socialised on the payment of compensation calculated on the basis of the ceiling under the scheme (Rs. 2000/- per month) which was to be only a rehabilitation compensation. In the public-owned centralised industries, the employees were to be associated with the management. Foreign concerns were either to go out of existence or pass under public ownership. In the decentralised industries, the instruments of production were to be owned either individually or cooperatively. The foreign trade of the country was to be placed under the control of a public corporation.

As regards banking and insurance, the minimum programme was to organise mass savings and control of investments in the interests of agriculture and decentralised industries and ultimately to socialise banks and insurance companies to save the national economy from the vicious monopoly of high finance.

As regards taxation, "our aim should be to evolve a financial system under which 50% of the public revenues collected may be spent by the village Panchayats. From the remaining fifty percent, the administration of the higher bodies should be financed".

In Sarvodaya society, "There shall be freedom for all and utmost equality; there shall be no class or castes; no exploitation nor injustice. an equal opportunity for each for fullest development. Man will be the centre of such a society, but self-interest will not be basis of social organisation. Life in such a society will be an integrated whole, so that work, art and play will form a unified pattern making possible the growth of an integrated human personality".

In Sarvodaya society, "Love is to reign and cooperation to prevail". A moral man in a moral society is the ultimate aim of Sarvodaya. There is to be absolute faith in man's dignity and growth, in human goodness and kindness. There is also to be full faith in non-violence and truth for changing the hearts of others and fighting against tyranny of all kinds. The ideal of Sarvodaya society was to be achieved by a decentralised socio-economic order based on cottage industries and village community life, self-governing and self-sufficient.

Vinobaji explained three characteristics of Sarvodaya society which were fundamental and must be present and operate simultaneously. To quote him, "No person should be dominant in society; there should only be a discipline of good thought; all faculties of the individual are to be dedicated to society which must provide the individual for growth and development; and the moral, social and economic values of all the callings performed honestly should be the same".

The social order in Sarvodaya society is to be free from every form of authority and "the ruler and ruled will be merged in the individual." Even the welfare state is rejected. To quote Jayaprakash Narayan, "The welfare state in the name of welfare threatens as much to enslave man to the state as in a totalitarian state. The people must cry halt to this creeping paralysis". The human society must be free from all coercive institutions. To quote Vinobaji, "What we seek is to grow out of the state of affairs where there is no Government into one where there is good Government and from that condition to one where people are free of Government altogether." The progression is to be from the conditions of anarchy where exploitation and oppression prevail, to "good Government" where no power is dominant and justice prevails, to a social order absolutely "free of Government".

The advocates of Sarvodaya do not exclude the existence of some form of Government in the intervening stage of Sarvodaya society. They condemn political parties and regard them as conspiracies against the people to divide them into rival camps. They give an impetus to the politics of power and encourage the use of unfair and unscrupulous means to win elections. They debase politics. They create differences between neighbours. Their role is divisive. With the growth of political parties, there is a deterioration in the status and prestige of the voters. Voters are purchased and the result is the *"suffrage for the rich and sufferance for the poor"*.

The advocates of Sarvodaya criticise the tyranny of majority rule. Vinobaji writes, "Political science lays down that everything should be decided by majority. It started counting votes. If there are fifty-one votes in favour and forty-nine votes in opposition, then the former must have an over-riding voice". To quote Jayaprakash Narayan, "Because fifty-one people out of a hundred decide to do a certain thing in a certain manner, why should the forty-nine people who do not agree with that, be forced to accept that decision? What kind of democracy is this? The laws passed in this way by the majority vote are not only oppressive to the minority, but also violate the principle of human unity and dignity as they consider the individual as one of the many rather than as a unique individual possessing a personality. It thus tends to dehumanise humanity."

The advocates of Sarvodaya also point out that a representative democracy strengthens the bureacracy in the country and that is not a desirable thing. The interests of the bureaucracy become paramount and those of the people are thrown into the background. The employees of the Government are known as public servants but paradoxically they live better lives than those of the public. Hence, Sarvodaya society is to be self-regulated and self-managed in small communities, whether urban or rural. Life in that society is to be a life of mutual aid and sharing and of freedom. There is to be no coercion of any kind. If at all there is to be coercion, it should be the coercion of love.

People living in Sarvodaya society are bound together in love and by love. Every individual is to live for others and all others are to live for every individual. According to Gandhiji, society is like a family and the relation between the individual and society is one of close inter-dependence. There is no place for the philosophy of *Laissez faire*. To quote Gandhiji, "I value individual freedom but you must not forget that man is essentially a social being. He has risen to the present status by learning to adjust his individualism to the requirement of social progress. Unrestricted individualism is the law of the beast of the jungle. We have learnt to strike the mean between individual freedom and social restraint. Willing submission to social restraint for the sake of the well-being of the whole society, enriches both the individual and the society of which one is a member." Gandhiji stood for the ideal of the "greatest good of all" throughout his life. According to him, the individual comes first. The individual and society must march ahead together. All faculties of the individual be dedicated to society which provides him with opportunities for free growth and development. Sarvodaya has been defined "as a synthesis of individualism and socialism, directed at the good of all."

The view of Gandhiji was that a lawyer's work has the same value as the barber's in as much as all have the same right of earning their livelihood. There should be no discrimination against labour. Vinobaji writes, "It is futile to try and draw up a scale of the values of mental or manual services. How shall we pay in money the person who nurses a sick man and sits up with him in the night? What should be a judge's price for his impartial judgement? How shall we apply the rule of three in order to know how much is due to the man who pulls out of the water or saves us from the raging fire? These are infinitely precious services, in other words, they are priceless. It is, therefore, right that, giving up calculation, every

one should devote himself to the service of all with all he has, while society does its duty by providing for his keep".

In Sarvodaya society, there is to be no difference between mental and manual labour. Both stand at par and both command equal utility and respect. The abilities and capacities of all are to be used for the greatest good of all. In Sarvodaya society, all wealth, including land, are to be a common property to be used for the good of each and all. There are to be no class distinctions. Every one has to work for society to the best of his capacity and receive from society according to his needs and in consonance with the needs of his fellowmen. Production in such a society is not to be for commerce but for consumption and mutual sharing. "There will be no accumulation of wealth because all wealth will belong to society and each will receive only according to his needs and in consonance with the needs of fellowmen. Even social accumulations will be limited, remaining only as a safeguard against unforeseen needs".

The Sarvodaya society cannot be created all of a sudden. The work of the transformation of society must take time. Gandhiji writes, "A Government cannot succeed in becoming entirely non-violent because it represents all the people. I do not today concieve of such a golden age. But I do believe in the possibility of a predominantly non-violent society. And I am working for it." Vinobaji says, "Our first step will be to get Gram Raj (Government by the village). Then law suits and disputes will be judged and settled within the village. Then it will be Ram Rajya (Kingdom of God), then there will no longer be any law suits or disputes and we shall live as one family".

The first stage in the transformation of a Sarvodaya society is Gram Raj or Panchayat Raj or village Swarajya. Gram Raj means the organisation of society based upon small administrative units with a population not exceeding three or four thousand people, self-sufficient for economic purposes and serving as ideal convenient units for representative democracy. Individual ownership gives way to community ownership. There is no individual possession of land, labour and wealth. "Each owns everything. Each will offer his all to the community and the community will take care of him."

In Gram Raj, the state does not disappear. However, the character of the Government is changed "in consonance with a non-violent social order". Such a state has certain characteristics. It is a secular state and all persons are free to profess and practise any religion or belief so long as it does not interfere with the similar rights of others. The rule of Shasan Vibhajan or decentralisation is to apply and every village is "a complete and a thorough state in miniature". In the words of Vinobaji, "The very term Swaraj or self-Government implies decentralisation of authority. The principle has, therefore, to be applied to every practicable limit to all fields of life, social, economic and political." The state represents the sovereignty of the people "based on pure moral authority." The basis of the authority of the state is the will of the governed. The state is to govern as little as possible. To quote Gandhiji, "I look upon the increase in the power of the state with the greatest fear because, although while apparently doing good by minimising exploitation, it does the greatest harm to mankind by destroying individuality which lies at the root of all progress. Such a state

is to promote the greatest good of all by the free and willing cooperation of all the people. The work of every Government functionary is to be judged by the amount of service done by him to society. To quote Gandhiji, "This body of servants derive their authority and power from service ungrudgingly and wisely done to their master, the whole of India." The policies of the Government have to be framed on the basis of Lok Niti and not Raj Niti. According to Vinobaji, in Sarvodaya society the able will devote and concentrate their activities to the service of the people. Individuals will be fully self-dependent and help each other. Non-violence will be the basis of their continual cooperation or occasional non-cooperation or resistance. Every kind of honest work will have equal value.

Sarvodaya puts emphasis on the necessity of improving human material first before anything else can be achieved. Unless every person is motivated by truth, honesty, non-violence and fellow-feeling for others, no progress is possible. Every one must feel for others. He must have the following thought: "I am in everybody and everybody is in me".

Citizens in Sarvodaya society are to be persons of lofty character. Every one is to live a life of virtue. There is to be no gambling, immorality or class hatred. Every member of Sarvodaya society is to contribute his or her quota for the welfare of all. Every one is to receive education. There are to be no rich or poor, high or low, privileged or unprivileged persons in Sarvodaya society. The Governor of the state is to live in a cottage and set an example for all. His motto is to be one of plain living and high thinking. Being a citizen of India, he is to be a citizen of the world. The minority is not to be exploited by the majority. In matters of conscience, the law of majority is to have no place. There is to be adult franchise. There is to be a voluntary limitation of human wants.

Sarvodaya stands for national unity and solidarity and condemns provincialism and religious fanaticism. To quote Gandhiji, "The bane of our life is our exclusive provincialism, whereas my province must be co-extensive with the Indian boundary so that ultimately it extends to the boundary of the earth. Else it perishes. The state should undoubtedly be secular."

Sarvodaya, Socialism and Communism

Gandhiji called himself a sociailst and even a Communist but for him socialism and Communism were transcendental forms of egalitarian social philosophy that find their fulfilment and culmination in Sarvodaya.

Socialism and Communism are primarily idealistic, ethical and humanitarian doctrines. They are concerned with the elimination of the misery of the millions, elevation of the status of the poor, unfortunate and downtrodden and founding a society based on the principles of economic equality and social justice. They champion the cause of the exploited, the oppressed and the underprivileged. Sarvodaya is also the vision of a just society free from exploitation, inequality and human miseries. In the words of Dr. Rajendra Prasad, Sarvodaya represents an aspiration "towards a society based on truth and non-violence in which there will be no distinction of caste or creed, no opportunity for exploitation and full scope for development both for individuals as well as groups". Jayapakash Narayan writes

about Sarvodaya, "What we desire is the establishment of a society in which there will be no exploitation, there will be perfect equality and each individual will have equal opportunities for development." Sarvodaya aims at a "classless, casteless and non-exploitative society".

About the basic inspirations of Sarvodaya and Communism, Vinobaji says, "There is no permanent conflict between the two ideologies—Marxism and Sarvodaya". Again, "Whatever differences there might be between Gandhism and Communism, there are also points of similarity between these and these too are important. The cause of the have-nots is the basic sentiment running through both. Both Gandhism and Communism regard the well-being of the poor and the oppressed with the intensely loving regard of the mother." K. G. Mashruwala observes, "The common point between Gandhi and Marx is the extreme concern of both for the suppressed and the oppressed, the resourceless and the ignorant, the dumb and the starving section of humanity."

Socialism, Communism and Sarvodaya are radical, non-egocentric and egalitarian doctrines that militate against the philosophy of *Laissez faire* in the economic and social fields. These ideologies are idealistic and ethical in inspiration and humanitarian in outlook. Both Marx and Engels aspired for an "association in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all." With his concern for the starving millions, Gandhiji also pitched his ambition in Sarvodaya or the welfare of all. Idealistically, there is so much of identity between the objectives of Communism and Sarvodaya that Jayaprakash Narayan was prompted to say, "If we are true socialists, we would be true followers of Sarvodaya as well."

However, it is not correct to say that Communism and Sarvodaya are identical. The view of Dr. Kumarappa is that the essentially spiritual basis of Sarvodaya "is the very anti-thesis of Communism which is awoedly materialistic, although in regard to its goal Sarvodaya is similar to Communism". K. G. Mashruwala says that "the difference between Communism and Sarvodaya is not in the ends but in the means."

Sarvodaya is a far more comprehensive and all-embracing concept than socialism or Communism although they have identical inspiration and objective. Strictly speaking, Socialism or Communism, as social philosophies, do not comprehend the welfare of the society as a whole, consisting of different sections of the people and different interests, but of a single class, the proletariat. Socialism and Communism justify their superiority over capitalism on the basis that they aspire to cater to the needs of the majority of the society whom they call the proletariat. The dictatorship of the proletariat is justified by the Communists on the ground that it is a type of dictatorship of the majority over the minority. Thus, socialism and Communism are basically class philosophies and at their best majoritarian philosophies. No doubt, they aspire to promote the welfare of the poor and the down-trodden and the oppressed and the economically and socially depressed, yet they sacrifice the minority on the altar of the majoritarian economic democracy. As an ideology, Sarvodaya transcends the socialist and Communist objectives. Strictly speaking, it is a social philosophy instead of being a class philosophy as it comprehends the welfare of

all and all sections of society. Socialism and Communism have remained sectarian philosophies or philosophy of a class, but Sarvodaya as an ideal aspires to transcend class division and sectarianism and becomes the philosophy of the entire society, all classes included. Emancipation and upliftment of all are within its purview. In the words of Vinobaji, Sarvodaya is a "supreme revolutionary concept. We do not aspire the emancipation of the greater or the greatest number of people. The only solution lies in the emancipation of all. Big and small, weak and the energetic, foolish and the intelligent, all are to be emancipated." All in society, whether rich or poor, lame or the blind, deaf or the dumb, require emancipation from the state of their economic, moral or spiritual degeneration under whose heels they suffer. The richer sections of society often lead a life of moral depravity and live in spiritual slums. They need emancipation as much as the poor who require economic regeneration from a state of economic servitude. All in the society need attention and the Gandhian concept of Sarvodaya neglects none. It attends to the material needs of the poor and the spiritual needs of the rich. Its objective is the emancipation of all. As a philosophy, Sarvodaya is not exclusive but all-inclusive and all-embracing. To quote R. R. Diwakar, "It is entirely inclusive and not exclusive even of the worst and the most wicked that may be found in the society." Sarvodaya repudiates the concept of the greatest good of the greatest number or the philosophy of the interests of the numerical majority. It accepts society as an integrated whole, different individuals constituting essential limbs of the same on whose health, unity and strength depend the viability of body politic.

Although socialism and Communism are primarily ethical and moral in inspiration, materialistic objective plays a predominant role in their philosophies. Both Marx and Engels advocated a society in which there was not disparity. They aspired for a social and economic order based on equality, fraternity, fellow-feelings and common sharing of the wealth of the community. Although their inspiration was primarily moral and ethical, the objective was purely material in the sense that they believed that by rearranging the economic structure of society, they would succeed in ushering in the new civilisation of socialism. They wanted to reconstruct society by adopting a materialistic standard. Jayaprakash Narayan writes, "Socialism and Communism, both lay great emphasis on material prosperity, on ever-growing production and on an ever-rising standard of living." Jayaprakash Narayan expressed the fear that due to too much of emphasis on materialistic values, equality, freedom and brotherhood would all be in danger of being submerged in a universal flood of materialism." As the socialists and Communists adopt a materialistic approach for attaining a moral objective, their hopes founder on the rock of party-centred and bureaucratised state machine. All types of tyranny are tolerated for the sake of material prosperity and socialism and Communism, in the sense of equality, fraternity and fellowship, vanish in the thin air.

As a philosophy, Sarvodaya connotes not merely the welfare of all but also the all-round development of all the individuals. Sarvodaya recognises that apart from the material welfare of the individual, his moral, spiritual, ethical and societarian developments are of equal or even of greater importance. It is based on the faith that the real development of the indi-

vidual becomes a mirage and in real welfare recedes unless his material welfare is reinforced by spiritual and ethical upliftment. To quote Jayaprakash Narayan, "I feel that the task of social reconstruction cannot succeed under the inspiration of a materialistic philosophy". Again, "Social reconstruction is impossible without human reconstruction." The Sarvodaya philosophy of Gandhiji puts emphasis on human character, its non-acquisitiveness and selflessness, its sociability and capacity to give up one's privileges for the greater good of the community at large. The emphasis is not on matreial self-aggrandisement but on spiritual and ethical values. The Gandhian philosophy of Sarvodaya puts emphasis on "love, care, sharing, sacrifice, feeling for the common good, non-possessiveness, self-discipline and so on. C. Rajagopalachari points out that Sarvodaya ideal is ethical and moral in conception and stands for the performance of one's duties towards society. "Sarvodaya includes all that is good. Gandhiji was ambitious to see that every one becomes good and for that he placed this ideal of Sarvodaya". The good of the individual in a comprehensive and all-embracing sense of all-round development or wholesale emancipation of men, materially, spiritually, ethically and morally, forms the true objective of Sarvodaya. R. R. Diwakar says that Sarvodaya "extends to all planes of existence, namely, physical, vital, mental and spiritual". Thus, Sarvodaya is not only different from but also superior to socialist and Communist ideologies which are mainly concerned with materialistic matters.

As a technique for the emancipation of man and his socio-economic transformation so that a society based on equality, fraternity and fellowship is created, Sarvodaya is more scientific, practicable and pragmatic than the Communist technique. Communism advocates a violent technique for a change-over in favour of an egalitarian society, a society free from exploitation and privilege. Force is not only considered necessary but also essential and inevitable. The methods of violence and bloodshed and forcible overthrow and liquidation of the bourgeoisie are considered necessary for bringing about a revolution leading to the emergence of an egalitarian society. There must be chaos, confusion and dislocation and loss of human values in order to bring about a change in the existing social and economic order. Both Marx and Engels expressed their conviction that "violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie lays the foundation for the sway of the proletariat". Lenin and Stalin also pursued the technique of violence to bring about a change in the Soviet Union. However, the adoption of a violent technique in Russia led to counter-violence that further accentuated the need for perfection of the technique of violence and its institutionalisation in the dictatorship of the proletariat which is oppressive, ruthless and intolerant. While trying to level out class distinctions based on the principle of privileges, the Communist countries have created a new class of party bosses, bureaucrats and technocrats who are not less privileged than the privileged class dislodged by them from power. Jayaprakash Narayan writes, "In terms of economic and political power, privilege and status, present-day Communist society is definitely a class society." A new form of exploitation of man by man has come into existence and that is exploitation by party bosses, bureaucrats and the state machine. It is true that in a Communist society, each individual is assured of a living but he ceases to be a man. He is made to conform to the ideology of the party and the state. He is made to think the way the new bosses direct him to think.

Milovan Djilas writes, "It is profoundly sickening to be compelled to remain silent when there is need for expression. It is tryranny at its worst to compel men not to think as they do, to compel men to express thoughts that are not their own".

To the tyranny of the party, the bureaucracy and the new establishment is added the tyranny of the centralised pattern of economy. Communism stands for wholesale nationalisation, central planning and centralised production and under such a system, the creativity of the individual and his originality do not find scope for expression and development. There is no blossoming of his personality. Jayaprakash Narayan writes, "Violence will not establish the rule of justice and equality in society. It will be the rule of a select coterie who will perpetuate their iron grip on the people. Violence ensures the victory of the party that is more skilled in its use." Again, "If the aim is to establish a society which will be free from exploitation and if that is achieved through violent means, the aim will still remain unrealised. Violence sets in motion new forces of exploitation. The society which is truly free from exploitation can be created only through non-violence". Narayan Desai, son of Mahadeo Desai, writes, "The general public continue to be slaves as a result of violent revolution. Earlier they were slaves of the rich. After the violent revolution, they would continue to be slaves of the strong. Such a revolution does no good to the general public."

In democratic socialism, the technique of legislation is adopted to bring about social transformation. In legislation, the majority principle is adopted and the view of the minority, even if it is rational, reasonable and scientific, is ignored. Legislation based on majority view may not succeed in achieving the objective of maximum welfare or good of the entire community. It may at best serve the interests of the majority. The technique of legislation may bring about structural and organisational changes in the economy but it cannot change the nature and character of the individual which is essential for his balanced and all-round development. The moral, ethical and spiritual aspects of his personality are ignored. The nationalisation of the entire economy may put the economy at the disposal of the state and that can be used in providing economic security to the people but it may completely fail to bring about moral, ethical and spiritual development. No legislation can succeed in making man morally, ethically and spiritually richer than before. No force of law can make him really altruistic, self-sacrificing, socially conscious and inspired by a sense of social responsibility. Economic equality may be enforced by legislation but fraternity and fellowship cannot be guaranteed by it. "Law can prevent undesirable action but it cannot provide inspiration for actions that are desirable. Law separates individuals instead of bringing them closer. It foments quarrels among contending parties instead of generating love and fellow-feeling."

The Gandhian concept of Sarvodaya avoids the evils of legislative or legal coercion involved in democratic socialism and violence and physical coercion involved in Communism. It relies on the *technique of conversion* for bringing about social transformation in the direction of a non-exploitative and egalitarian society. Gandhiji was concerned with the welfare of all and hence rejected the view that the welfare of all can ever be attained

by physical, intellectual and moral coercion perpetrated by a section of the people against the rest of the community. Gandhiji believed that Sarvodaya could be realised only by the application of a moral and ethical method. The existing inequalities in the society had to be eliminated but that was not to be achieved by the violent overthrow of the men of wealth and property. Gandhiji believed that through the application of the technique of persuasion and appeal to the innate good sense of the rich and the privileged, they may be made to renounce their privileges and apply their superfluous wealth for the welfare of the community. Such renunciation of wealth and privilege was to be for the good of the poor and the rich. The degeneration in moral, ethical and spiritual terms that would have been the result of violence and counter-violence, will be avoided. "The essence of the revolution contemplated by Savodaya is that it plans its faith on human approach, at the root of which stands the concept of revolution by human beings for the proliferation of human values and human virtues, and through a method that is strictly humane".

The advocates of Sarvodaya also differ from the Communists and socialists in respect of the *role of the state*. Both the Communists and the socialists have their faith in the potency of the state to bring about equality in society. In the economic sphere, the Communists and socialists advocate centralisation and concentration of economic powers in the hands of the state and the proliferation of the economic activities of the state. To quote Jayaprakash Narayan, "Democratic socialists, communists as well as welfarists are all statists". The concentration of both political and economic power in the hands of the state leads to too much of bureaucratisation, dehumanisation and loss of individual freedom. To quote Jayaprakash Narayan, "The democratic state remains a Leviathan that will sit heavily on the freedom of the people". The state is still worse under Communism. It is true that the Communists talk about the withering away of the state in the long run, but during the transitional period, the state is not only tolerated but also becomes more and more powerful. It devours the lofty ideals of classless society—liberty, equality, fraternity and fellowship. Jayaprakash Narayan writes, "The remedy is to create and develop forms of socialist living through the voluntary endeavour of the people rather than seek to establish socialism by the use of the power of the state. In other words, the remedy is to establish people's socialism, rather than state socialism".

Sarvodaya stands for political and economic decentralisation and the individual gets full scope for the development of his personality as an integral part of the social system. Sarvodaya is a type of "people's socialism" or "voluntary socialism" as against "state and enforced socialism". By its emphasis on decentralised economic system, minimum reliance on state machine, a gradual disintegration of the central authority and transfer of economic and political powers to smaller units from the very beginning, Sarvodaya paves the way for the real withering away of the state. The withering away of the state in the future may be doubtful and uncertain but the advocates of Sarvodaya take concrete steps towards the withering away of the state at the very beginning. To quote Vinobaji, "The authors of the Puranas believed in the age of deliverance in the future but Sarvodaya believes in the age of deliverance here and now."

As a concept of social engineering and instrument of social transformation, Sarvodaya is a lofty ideal far more all-inclusive and comprehensive than socialism or Communism. It is not a sectaian creed. It is concerned with the creation of a society of men and promotion of family spirit and sense of fraternity among the entire human race. Sarvodaya is not concerned with economic reconstruction alone, but is an all-embracing ideal with special emphasis on human values and moral and ethical considerations. Considered from all angles, Sarvodaya is a far nobler, subtler, loftier, broader, deeper and transcendental concept than socialism or Communism. To quote Vinobaji, "Sarvodaya is a better word than 'socialist'; it is also our own native word, born from our own soil and carrying a noble meaning. We do not use the word because we are a little doubtful if we can live up to it. So we prefer the word 'socialist'. But our goal is in fact Sarvodaya and our people are being prepared for absorption into the sea of Sarvodaya".

It is contended that socialism and Communism can realise their true meaning and fulfil their objectve by merging their identity with Sarvodaya. Jayaprakash Narayan writes, "Socialism as we understand it today, cannot take mankind to the sublime goals of freedom, equality, brotherhood and peace. Socialism no doubt gives promise to bring mankind closer to those goals than any other competing social philosophy. But I am persuaded that unless socialism is transformed into Sarvodaya, those goals would remain beyond its reach". Acharya Vinobaji writes, "There is no permanent conflict between the two ideologies—Marxism and Sarvodaya. As the Ganges becomes wider and wider and moves on and finally merges in the ocean, I hope Marxism will merge in Sarvodaya one day".

Criticism

The critics of Sarvodaya maintain that while its theoretical perfection cannot be denied, it is impossible to realise in actual practice its ideal. Sarvodaya is bound to flounder on the rock of human nature. We are expecting too much from human beings as they are. Most of them are selfish and it is too much to expect that they will change overnight or change at all. The whole basis of Sarvodaya is the transformation of the present man and if that does not happen, the rest of the super-structure cannot be raised at all.

The exponents of Sarvodaya stand for the abolition of political parties as they do not work properly. However, that is not the right solution. To quote Burns, "No one denies that existing representative assemblies are defective, but even if an automobile does not work well, it is foolish to go back to a farm cart, however romantic." Political parties are bound to stay so long as there is freedom of thought and human nature is what it is. The solution lies in their reformation and reorganisation and not in abolition.

The advocates of Sarvodaya attack the majority rule but the majority does not always and necessarily reduce the minority to a cipher. Moreover, unanimity in the field of legislation is an impossibility. It is true that legislation also helps in creating conditions for better living.

While decentralisation is a welcome suggestion, it should not be based

on the self-sufficiency of the villages. Geographical decentralisation is not a panacea for all our problems. It adds to the evils of localism, provincialism and regionalism.

Sarvodaya stands for direct democracy but that is not suited to modern conditions of society. Sarvodaya does not recognise the necessity of analysing social development from a scientific point of view. It ignores the reality of class divisions in society and is unrealistic.

Sarvodaya is an attempt to develop the ideas of Gandhiji in the framework of independent India. It is a dynamic philosophy which can make possible the advent of a radically transformed humanity. It is not a complete philosophy but it gives an integrated thought structure. We may not agree with all the detailed techniques and formulas of Sarvodaya, but its vision is definitely majestic and inspiring. Its great contribution lies in the assertion of a moral approach to the problems of man. It gives us the message of love for all. It can help humanity to solve many of its problems.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Bhave, Vinoba : *Sarvodaya and Communism.*
Bhave, Vinoba : *Sarvodaya Vichar Aur Swarajya Sastra.*
Datta, D.M. : *The Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi.*
Deo, Sankar Rao : *Sarvodaya Ka Itihas Aur Sastra.*
Desai, Narayan : *Sarvodaya Vichar.*
Dharmadhikari, D. : *Sarvodaya Darshan.*
Dhawan, G.N : *The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi.*
Diwakar, R.R. : *Revolutionary Bhoodan.*
Kripalani, J.B. : *The Gandhian Way.*
Majumdar, B.B. : *The Gandhian Concept of the State.*
Narayan, J.P. : *In Revolutionary Bhoodan.*
Narayan, J.P. : *A Picture of Sarvodaya Social Order.*
Narayan, J.P. : *From Socialism to Sarvodaya.*
Ramchandra Rao, S.K. : *The Idea of Sarvodaya.*
Sharma, B.S. : *Gandhi as a Political Thinker.*
Tandon, Viswanath : *The Political and Social Philosophy of Sarvodaya After Gandhi.*
Verma, V.P. : *The Political Philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi and Sarvodaya.*

INDEX

A

B

C

D

E

G

H

I

J

K

L

M

N

P

R

S

T

SOME OTHER BOOKS ON POLITICAL SCIENCE

White
PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Vidya Bhushan and Vishneo Bhagwan
A TEXTBOOK OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

V. Venkata Rao
ANCIENT POLITICAL THOUGHT
HISTORY OF POLITICAL THEORIES

V. Venkata Rao & Niru Hazarika
LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT IN INDIA

S.R. Nigam
LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

R.C. Aggarwal
CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF INDIA & NATIONAL MOVEMENT
PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
MODERN INDIAN CONSTITUTION & ADMINISTRATION

A.C. Kapoor
PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
SELECT CONSTITUTIONS
INDIAN POLITICAL SYSTEM
CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY OF INDIA
REFRESHER COURSE IN POLITICAL SCIENCE— THEORY
REFRESHER COURSE IN POLITICAL SCIENCE — MODERN CONSTITUTIONS

B.L. Grover & S. Grover
EVOLUTION OF INDIA CONSTITUTION & FREEDOM STRUGGLE

A. Sen
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SINCE WORLD WAR I

B.C. Rout
DEMOCRATIC CONSTITUTION OF INDIA
POLITICAL THEORIES : CONCEPTS & IDEOLOGIES

V.D. Mahajan
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SINCE 1900
SELECT MODERN GOVERNMENTS
CONSTITUTION OF INDIA
CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT & NATIONAL MOVEMENT OF INDIA
PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
RECENT POLITICAL THOUGHT

K.K. Kulshrestha
REFRESHER COURSE IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

S.I. Benn & R.S. Peters
SOCIAL PRINCIPLES & THE DEMOCRATIC STATE

Harold J. Laski
PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND
GRAMMAR AND POLITICS
INTRODUCTION TO POLITICS

Forsyth, Keens-Soper & Sovigeor
THEORY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Peter Self
ADMINISTRATIVE THEORIES & POLITICS

John E. Spero
THE POLITICS OF INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS

17 127

S. CHAND & COMPANY (PVT) LTD